

TABLE OF DATES

xxi

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
<p>1773. The people of Boston board the English ships and throw the tea overboard.</p> <p>1774. Congress meets at Philadelphia and denies right of Parliament to tax colonies.—Accession of Louis XVI.</p> <p>1775. George Washington appointed Commander-in-Chief of American forces.</p> <p>1775-83. War of American Independence.</p> <p>1776 (July 4). Declaration of Independence by United States.</p> <p>1778. Death of Earl of Chatham. War with France in Europe. France recognizes independence of United States.</p> <p>1781. England at war with Spain, France, Holland, and American colonies. Cornwallis surrenders at Yorktown.</p> <p>1782. Lord North resigns.—Lord Rockingham and then Lord Shelburne, Prime Ministers. Grattan's Declaration of Right accepted by Irish Parliament.</p> <p>1783 (April 2). Coalition ministry under Duke of Portland as Prime Minister.</p>	<p>1772. Warren Hastings, Governor of Bengal.—Draws up plan of government.</p> <p>Directors of East India Company declare a deficit, and appeal to Lord North for help. (November.) Secret Parliamentary inquiry into affairs of Company.</p> <p>1773. Regulating Act passed (13 Geo. III, c. 63). Motion condemning Clive rejected.</p> <p>1774. Warren Hastings becomes first Governor-General of India. Rohilla War. Death of Clive.</p> <p>1775. Benares and Ghazipur ceded to Company. Government of Bombay occupy Salsette and Bassein.</p> <p>1776. Trial and execution of Nuncomar. Maráthá War.</p> <p>1778. English seize French settlements in India.</p> <p>1779. Maráthás repel English advance on Poona. League of Mysore. Maráthás and Nizám against English.</p> <p>1780. Hyder Ali ravages Carnatic.</p> <p>1781. Benares insurrection.—Defeat of Hyder Ali at Porto Novo.—Treaty of Peace with Maráthás. Parliamentary inquiries into administration of justice in Bengal and into causes of Carnatic War.—Act passed to amend the Regulating Act (21 Geo. III, c. 70).</p> <p>1782. Death of Hyder Ali. Naval battles between French and English in Bay of Bengal.</p> <p>1783. Pondicherry and other French settlements restored to France by Treaty of Versailles.</p>

CHAPTER III

DIGEST OF STATUTORY ENACTMENTS RELATING TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

N.B.—The marginal references in square brackets [] indicate the enactments reproduced.

PART I.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN COUNCIL.

The Crown.

Government of
India by
the
Crown.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 2.]

1.—(1) British India (a) is governed by and in the name of His Majesty the King (b).

(2) All rights which, if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed, might have been exercised by the East India Company in relation to any territories, may be exercised by and in the name of His Majesty as rights incidental to the government of British India (c).

(a) The expressions 'British India' and 'India' are defined by s. 124 of this Digest, in accordance with the Interpretation Act, 1889 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 18), and the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (7) (27)).

The language used in the Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 1) was: 'the territories *now* in the possession and under the government of the said company.' A similar expression was used in the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22). Hence questions arose as to the application of the Acts to territories subsequently acquired. Those questions have, however, now been set at rest by s. 3 of the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14), which expressly declares the applicability of the Acts of 1833 and 1861 to territories subsequently acquired.

(b) The Royal Titles Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 10), authorized the Queen, with a view to the recognition of the transfer of the government of India from the East India Company to the Crown, by Royal Proclamation, to make such addition to the style and titles appertaining to the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom and its dependencies as to Her Majesty *it s em meet*. Accordingly the Queen,

the words, 'Indiæ Imperatrix, or Empress of India.' (London Gazette, April 28, 1876, 2667), and 'Emperor of India' forms part of the title of the present King.

(c) These rights include the right to acquire and cede territory. See *Lachmi Narayan v. Raja Pratab Singh*, I. L. R. 2 All. 1, and p. 36 above, and note (a) to s. 36 below.

The Secretary of State.

2.—(1) Subject to the provisions embodied in this Digest, one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State (in this Digest referred to as 'the Secretary of State') has and performs all such or the like powers and duties in anywise relating to the government or revenues of India (a), and all such or the like powers over all officers appointed or continued under the Government of India Act, 1858, as, if that Act had not been passed, might or should have been exercised or performed by the East India Company, or by the Court of Directors or Court of Proprietors of that Company, either alone or by the direction or with the sanction or approbation of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, in relation to that government or those revenues and the officers and servants of that Company, and also all such powers as might have been exercised by the said Commissioners alone (b).

The Secretary of State.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 3.]

(2) In particular, the Secretary of State may, subject to the provisions embodied in this Digest, superintend, direct, and control all acts, operations, and concerns which in anywise relate to or concern the government or revenues of India, and all grants of salaries, gratuities, and allowances, and all other payments and charges whatever out of or on the revenues of India.

[3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 25.]

(3) Any warrant or writing under His Majesty's Royal Sign Manual which, before the passing of the Government of India Act, 1858, was required by law to be countersigned by the president of the Commissioners for the Affairs of India must in lieu thereof be countersigned by the Secretary of State (c).

[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 3.]

CHAPTER III

DIGEST OF STATUTORY ENACTMENTS RELATING TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

N.B.—The marginal references in square brackets [] indicate the enactments reproduced.

PART I.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN COUNCIL.

The Crown.

Government of
India by
the
Crown.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 2.]

1.—(1) British India (a) is governed by and in the name of His Majesty the King (b).

(2) All rights which, if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed, might have been exercised by the East India Company in relation to any territories, may be exercised by and in the name of His Majesty as rights incidental to the government of British India (c).

(a) The expressions 'British India' and 'India' are defined by s. 124 of this Digest, in accordance with the Interpretation Act, 1880 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 18), and the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (7) (27)).

The language used in the Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 1) was: 'the territories now in the possession and under the government of the said company.' A similar expression was used in the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22). Hence questions arose as to the application of the Acts to territories subsequently acquired. Those questions have, however, now been set at rest by s. 3 of the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14), which expressly declares the applicability of the Acts of 1833 and 1861 to territories subsequently acquired.

(b) The Royal Titles Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 10), authorized the Queen, with a view to the recognition of the transfer of the government of India from the East India Company to the Crown, by Royal Proclamation, to make such addition to the style and titles appertaining to the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom and its dependencies as to Her Majesty might seem meet. Accordingly the Queen, by proclamation dated April 28, 1876, added to her style and titles

the like yearly salaries as may for the time being be paid to any other Secretary of State and his under secretaries respectively (d).

(a) The term 'revenues of India' is retained here and elsewhere, though in an Act of Parliament it might now be more accurate to speak of the revenues of *British India*.

(b) The Secretary of State is the minister through whom the authority of the Crown over India is exercised in England, and thus corresponds roughly to the president of the Board of Control (Commissioners for the Affairs of India), under the system which prevailed before the Act of 1858. He is appointed by the delivery of the seals of office, and appoints two under secretaries, one permanent, who is a member of the Civil Service, the other parliamentary, who changes with the Government. The Act of 1858 authorized the appointment of a fifth principal Secretary of State, in addition to the four previously existing (Home, Foreign, Colonial, and War).

The office of Secretary of State is constitutionally a unit, though there are five officers. Hence any Secretary of State is capable of performing the functions of any other, and consequently it is usual and proper to confer statutory powers in general terms on 'a (or "the") Secretary of State,' an expression which is defined by the Interpretation Act, 1889, as meaning one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State. But in matters relating to India there are certain functions which must be exercised by the Secretary of State *in Council*. See Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution* (second edition), ii. pp. 167, 282.

(c) See e.g. the provisions as to removal of officers below, s. 21.

(d) i.e. £5,000 to the Secretary of State, £2,000 to the permanent Under Secretary, and £1,500 to the Parliamentary Under Secretary.

The Council of India.

3.—(1) The Council of India consists of not more than fifteen and not less than ten members (a).

(2) The right of filling any vacancy in the Council of India is vested in the Secretary of State.

(3) Unless at the time of an appointment to fill a vacancy in the Council of India nine of the then existing members of the council are persons who have served or resided in British India (b) for at least ten years, and have not last left British India more than ten years before the date of their appointment, the person appointed to fill the vacancy must be so qualified.

The
Council
of India.

[21 & 22

Vict. c.

106, ss. 7,
10, 11, 13.

32 & 33

Vict. c.

97, ss. 1,

2, 3, 6.

52 & 53

Vict. c.

65.]

(4) Every member of the Council of India holds office, except as by this section provided, for a term of ten years.

(5) The Secretary of State may for special reasons of public advantage reappoint for a further term of five years any member of the Council of India whose term of office has expired. In any such case the reasons for the reappointment must be set forth in a minute signed by the Secretary of State and laid before both Houses of Parliament. Save as aforesaid, a member of the Council of India is not capable of reappointment.

(6) The Secretary of State may also, if he thinks fit, <sup>[39 & 40
Vict. c. 7.]</sup> appoint any person having professional or other peculiar qualifications to be a member of the Council of India during good behaviour. The special reasons for every such appointment must be stated in a minute signed by the Secretary of State and laid before both Houses of Parliament. Not more than three persons so appointed may be members of the council at the same time. If a member so appointed resigns his office, and has at the date of his resignation been a member of the council for more than ten years, the King may, by warrant under His Sign Manual, countersigned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, grant to him, out of the revenues of India, a retiring pension during life of five hundred pounds (c).

(7) Any member of the Council of India may, by writing signed by him, resign his office. The instrument of resignation must be recorded in the minutes of the council.

(8) Any member of the Council of India may be removed by His Majesty from his office on an address of both Houses of Parliament.

(9) There is paid to each member of the Council of India out of the revenues of India the annual salary of twelve hundred pounds.

(a) The Council of India is, in a certain, but very limited, sense the successor of the old Court of Directors. Under the Act of 1858 it consisted of fifteen members, eight appointed by the Crown, and seven elected, in the first instance, by the Court of Directors, and

subsequently by the council itself. The members of the council held office during good behaviour, but were removable on an address by both Houses of Parliament. By an Act of 1860 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 97) the right of filling all vacancies in the council was vested in the Secretary of State, and the tenure was changed from tenure during good behaviour to tenure for a term of ten years, with a power of reappointment for five years, 'for special reasons.' By an Act of 1880 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 65) the Secretary of State was authorized to abstain from filling vacancies in the council until the number should be reduced to ten.

(b) It will be observed that service or residence in *British India* (see 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 1), not in India, is the qualification.

(c) This exceptional power, which was conferred by an Act of 1876 (30 & 31 Vict. c. 7), was exercised in the case of Sir H. S. Maine, and was probably conferred with special reference to his case.

Seat in
council
disquali-
fication
for Parlia-
ment.

[21 & 22
Vict. c.

106, s. 12.]

Claims to
compensa-
tion.

[32 & 33
Vict. c.

97, s. 7.]

4. A member of the Council of India is not capable of sitting or voting in Parliament.

This restriction applies to seats in both Houses of Parliament.

5. If at any time it appears to Parliament expedient to reduce the number or otherwise to deal with the constitution of the Council of India, a member of that council is not entitled to claim any compensation for the loss of his office, or for any alteration in the terms and conditions under which his office is held, unless he has served in his office for a period of ten years.

This enactment is contained in the Act of 1860 which changed the tenure of members of council.

Duties of
council.

[21 & 22
Vict. c.

106, s. 19.]

6. The Council of India, under the direction of the Secretary of State, and subject to the provisions embodied in this Digest, conducts the business transacted in the United Kingdom in relation to the government of India and the correspondence with India.

Powers of
council.

[21 & 22
Vict. c.

106, s. 22.]

7.—(1) All powers required to be exercised by the Secretary of State in Council, and all powers of the Council of India, may be exercised at meetings of the council at which not less than five members are present.

(2) The Council of India may act notwithstanding any vacancy in their number.

8.—(1) The Secretary of State is the president of the Council of India, with power to vote. President and vice-president of council.

(2) The Secretary of State in Council may appoint any member of the Council of India to be vice-president thereof, and the Secretary of State may at any time remove any person so appointed. [21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, ss. 21,
22.]

(3) At every meeting of the Council of India the Secretary of State, or in his absence the vice-president, if present, or in the absence of both of them, one of the members of the council, chosen by the members present at the meeting, presides.

9. Meetings of the Council of India are convened and held when and as the Secretary of State directs, but one such meeting at least must be held in every week. Meetings of the council.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 22.]

10.—(1) At any meeting of the Council of India at which the Secretary of State is present, if there is a difference of opinion on any question, except (a) a question with respect to which a majority of votes at a meeting is by this Digest declared to be necessary, the determination of the Secretary of State is final. Procedure at meetings.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 23.]

(2) In case of an equality of votes at any meeting of the council the person presiding at the meeting has a casting vote.

(3) All acts done at a meeting of the council in the absence of the Secretary of State require the approval in writing of the Secretary of State.

(4) In case of difference of opinion on any question decided at a meeting of the council, the Secretary of State may require that his opinion and the reasons for it be entered in the minutes of the proceedings, and any member of the council who has been present at the meeting may require that his opinion and any reasons for it that he has stated at the meeting be also entered in like manner.

(a) A majority of votes is necessary for decisions on the following matters:—

1. Appropriation of revenues or property, s. 23.
2. Issuing securities for money, s. 28.

whether British subjects or not. See the definition of 'Government' in Act X of 1897, s. 3 (21).

It has been argued that the expression 'British subjects of Her Majesty' was used in the Act of 1865 in its older and narrower sense, as not including persons of Asiatic descent. If so, there would be no power under this enactment to legislate for natives of Ceylon in the Nizam's territories. In practice, however, the questions referred to in this note do not cause difficulty because a wider power to legislate for persons and things outside British India can be exercised under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act. See below, ch. v.

(d) The Indian Articles of War are contained in Act V of 1869, as amended by Act XII of 1894. The words 'or followers' do not occur in the Act of 1833, but their insertion seems to be justified by the Army Act, which, after a saving for Indian military law respecting officers or soldiers or followers in Her Majesty's Indian forces, being natives of India, enacts (s. 180 (2) (b)) that, 'For the purposes of this Act, the expression "Indian military law" means the Articles of War or other matters made, enacted, or in force, or which may hereafter be made, enacted, or in force, under the authority of the Government of India; and such articles or other matters shall extend to such native officers, soldiers, and followers, wherever serving.'

(e) The East India Company used to keep a small naval force, known first as the Bombay Marine, and afterwards as the Indian Navy. This force was abolished in 1863, when it was decided that the Royal Navy should undertake the defence of India against serious attack by sea, and should also provide for the performance of the duties in the Persian Gulf which had been previously undertaken by the Indian Navy. After the abolition of the Indian Navy, two small services, the Bengal Marine and the Bombay Marine, came into existence for local purposes, but were found to be expensive and inefficient, and accordingly the Government of India amalgamated them into the force now known as the Indian Marine. According to the preamble to the Indian Marine Service Act, 1884 (47 & 48 Vict. c. 38), this force was 'employed under the direction of the Governor-General in Council for the transport of troops, the guarding of convict settlements, the suppression of piracy, the survey of coasts and harbours, the visiting of lighthouses, the relief of distressed or wrecked vessels, and other local objects,' and was maintained out of the revenues of India.

The ships on this establishment were Government ships, but did not form part of the Royal Navy, and consequently did not fall within the provisions either of the Merchant Shipping Acts on the one hand, or of the Naval Discipline Act (29 & 30 Vict. c. 109) on the other, or of any corresponding Indian enactments. They were in fact in the same kind of position as some of the vessels employed by the Board of Trade and by the Post Office in British waters. Under these circumstances it was thought expedient that the Governor-General in Council should have power to make laws for the maintenance of discipline in their service; and, accordingly, the Indian Marine Service

Act, 1884, was passed for this purpose. It enabled the Governor-General in Council, at legislative meetings, to make laws for all persons employed or serving in or belonging to Her Majesty's Indian Marine Service, but the punishments were to be of the same character as those under the Navy Acts, and the Act was not to operate beyond the limits of Indian waters as defined by the Act, i. e. the old limits of the East India Company's charter. The reasons for the limitation to Indian waters were, doubtless, that it was desirable to maintain the local character of the objects for which, according to the preamble, the establishment was maintained: that if, under exceptional circumstances, a ship belonging to the establishment was sent to English waters, on transport service or otherwise, no practical difficulties in maintaining discipline were likely to arise; and that it was not desirable to give to these ships and to their officers, outside Indian waters, their proper sphere of operations, a status practically equivalent to that of the Royal Navy. The officers of the Indian Marine Service are appointed by the Governor-General in Council, but do not hold commissions from the King, and consequently cannot exercise powers of command over officers and men of the Royal Navy. The ships are unarmed, and therefore are practically of no use for the suppression of piracy. In time of war, however, the King may, by Proclamation or Order in Council, direct that any vessel belonging to the Indian Marine Service, and the men and officers serving therein, shall be under the command of the senior naval officer of the station where the vessel is, and while the vessel is under such command, it is to be deemed, to all intents, a vessel of war of the Royal Navy, and the men and officers are to be under the Naval Discipline Act, and subject to regulations issued by the Admiralty with the concurrence of the Secretary of State for India in Council (47 & 48 Viet. c. 38, s. 6).

Under the power conferred by the Indian Marine Service Act, 1884, the Indian Legislature passed the Indian Marine Act, 1887 (Act XIV of 1887), which established for the Indian Marine Service a code of discipline corresponding to that in force for the Royal Navy, and declared that Chapter VII of the Indian Penal Code, 'as to offences relating to the Army and Navy,' was to apply as if Her Majesty's Indian Marine Service were comprised in the Navy of the Queen (s. 79).

On the relations between the Royal Navy and the Indian Marine Service, see the evidence given by Sir John Hext and others in the First Report of the Royal Commission on the administration of the expenditure of India (1896).

(f) The words 'or over any persons for whom the Governor-General in Council has power to make laws' are not in the Act of 1861, but seem to be implied by the context.

(g) 'Affecting' would probably be construed as equivalent to 'altering.'

(h) The short titles given by the Short Titles Act, 1896, are substituted in the text for the longer titles used in the Act of 1861. It will be observed that, subject to the exceptions here specified, the

Parliamentary enactments relating to India may be repealed or altered by Indian legislation. This power is saved by the language used in producing these enactments in the Digest. See e. g. ss. 101, 103, 105.

(i) The language of the Act of 1861 is: 'any provisions of any Act passed in this present session of Parliament, or hereafter to be passed, in anywise affecting Her Majesty's Indian territories, or the inhabitants thereof.' See *R. v. Meares*, 14 Bengal Law Reports, 106, 112.

(j) 44 & 45 Vict. c. 58. Under s. 136 of this Act as amended by s. 4 of the Army (Amendment) Act, 1895 (58 & 59 Vict. c. 7), the pay of an officer or soldier of Her Majesty's regular forces must be paid without any deduction other than the deductions authorized by this or by any other Act, or by any Royal warrant for the time being, or by any law passed by the Governor-General of India in Council. Thus the Indian Legislature has power to authorize deductions from military pay, but this power can hardly be treated as power to amend the Army Act.

(k) After these words followed in the Act of 1861 the words 'or the constitution and rights of the East India Company.' It will be remembered that the Company was not formally dissolved until 1874.

(l) 'Whereon may depend . . . United Kingdom.' These words are somewhat indefinite, and a wide meaning was attributed to them by Mr. Justice Norman in the case of *In the matter of Ameer Khan*, 6 Bengal Law Reports, 392, 456, 459. In this case, which turned on the validity of an arrest under Regulation III of 1818, the powers of the Indian Legislature under successive charters and enactments were fully discussed.

(m) Are the words 'or the sovereignty,' &c., to be connected with 'whereon may depend,' or with 'affecting'? Probably the latter. If so, legislation to authorize or confirm the cession of territory is placed by these words beyond the powers of the Indian Legislature. The power of the Crown to cede territory in India and elsewhere was fully discussed in the Bhaunagar case, *Damodhar Khan v. Deoram Khanji*, 1 L. R. 1 Bom. 367, L. R. 2 App. Cas. 332, where the Judicial Committee, without expressly deciding the main question at issue, clearly intimated that in their opinion the Crown possessed the power. This opinion was followed by the high court at Allahabad in the case of *Lachmi Narayan v. Raja Pratab Singh*, 1 L. R. 2 All. 1. See further, Sir H. S. Maine's Minute of 1868 on the Rampore Cession case (No. 79), and the debates in Parliament in 1890 on the Anglo-German Agreement Bill, by which the assent of Parliament was given to the agreement for the cession of Heligoland, and in 1904 (June 1) on the Anglo-French Convention Bill.

(n) i. e. a chartered high court. See s. 124.

(o) This reproduces 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 46, and is the reason why the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council is recited in the preamble to the Punjab Courts Act, 1884 (XVIII of 1884, printed in the Punjab Code).

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1877. Russo-Turkish War.	1877 (January 1). Queen proclaimed Empress of India at Delhi.
1878. Treaties of San Stefano (March) and Berlin (July).	1878. Invasion of Afghanistan. 1879 (July). Treaty of Gandamak. (September.) Cavagnari killed at Cabul.—English invade Afghanistan.
1880 (April 25). W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.	1880-4. Lord Ripon, Viceroy. 1880 (July). Abdurrahman recognized as Amir of Afghanistan.
1882. Indian troops used in the Egyptian War.	—Battle of Maiwand. General Roberts' march from Cabul to Kandahar.
1885 (June 24). Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister.	1884. Boundary Commission appointed to settle North-West frontier.
1886 (February 6). W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.	1884-8. Lord Dufferin, Viceroy.
(August 3.) Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister.	1885. Third Burmese War.
1887. Jubilee of Queen Victoria's reign.	1886 (January 1). Upper Burma annexed. (November 21.) Legislative Council established for North-Western Provinces.
1892 (August 18). W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.	1888-93. Lord Lansdowne, Viceroy. 1889. Military expeditions sent against hill tribes.
1894 (March 3). Lord Rosebery, Prime Minister.	1890. Chin and Lushai expeditions.—Rising in Manipur.
1895 (July 2). Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister.	1891. Massacre in Manipur. 1892. Constitution and procedure of Indian Legislative Councils altered by Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14).
	1893. Separate armies of Madras and Bombay abolished by Madras and Bombay Armies Act, 1893 (56 & 57 Vict. c. 62).
	(June 26.) Indian Mint closed. 1894 (January 27). Lord Elgin, Viceroy.
	(December 27.) Import duty imposed on cotton.
	1895. Chitral Expedition.
	1896. Appearance of plague in Bombay.

3. Sale or mortgage of property, s. 31.
4. Contracts, s. 32.
5. Alteration of salaries, s. 80.
6. Furlough rules, s. 80.
7. Indian appointments, s. 90.
8. Appointments of natives of India to offices reserved for Indian Civil Service, s. 94.
9. Provisional appointments to posts on the Governor-General's Council, s. 83, and to reserved offices, s. 95.

Commit-
tees of
council.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 20.]

11. The Secretary of State may constitute committees of the Council of India for the more convenient transaction of business, and direct what departments of business are to be under those committees respectively, and generally direct the manner in which all business of the council or committees thereof is to be transacted (a).

(a) The existing committees are Finance, Political and Secret, Military, Revenue and Statistics, Public Works, Stores, and Judicial and Public.

Orders and Dispatches.

Submis-
sion of
orders, &c.,
to council,
and record
of opinions
thereon.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, ss.
24, 25.]

12.—(1) Subject to the provisions (a) embodied in this Digest, every order or communication proposed to be sent to India, and every order proposed to be made in the United Kingdom by the Secretary of State under the Government of India Act, 1858, must, unless it has been submitted to a meeting of the Council of India, be deposited in the council room for the perusal of all members of the council during seven days before the sending or making thereof.

(2) Any member of the Council of India may record, in a minute-book kept for that purpose, his opinion with respect to any such order or communication, and a copy of every opinion so recorded must be sent forthwith to the Secretary of State.

(3) If the majority of the Council of India so record their opinions against any act proposed to be done, the Secretary of State must, unless he defers to the opinion of the majority, record his reasons for acting in opposition thereto.

(a) The qualifications relate to urgency orders under s. 13 and secret orders under s. 14.

13.—(1) Where it appears to the Secretary of State that the dispatch of any communication or the making of any order, not being an order for which a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India is by this Digest declared to be necessary (*a*), is urgently required, the communication may be sent or order made, although it has not been submitted to a meeting of the Council of India or deposited for the perusal of the members of that council.

Provision for cases of urgency. [21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 26.]

(2) In any such case the Secretary of State must, except as by this Digest provided (*b*), record the urgent reasons for sending the communication or making the order, and give notice thereof to every member of the council.

(*a*) See note on s. 10.

(*b*) The exception is under the next section, s. 14.

14.—(1) Where an order concerns the levying of war or the making of peace, or the treating or negotiating with any prince or State, or the policy to be observed with respect to any prince or State, and is not an order for which a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India is by this Digest declared to be necessary (*a*), and is an order which in the opinion of the Secretary of State is of a nature to require secrecy, the Secretary of State may send the order to the Governor-General in Council or to any local Government or officer in India without having submitted the order to a meeting of the Council of India or deposited it for the perusal of the members of that council, and without recording or giving notice of the reasons for making the order (*b*).

Provision as to secret orders and dispatches. [33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 19, 20, 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 36, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 27.]

(2) Where any dispatch from the Governor-General in Council, or from the Governor in Council of Madras or of Bombay, concerns the government of British India, or any of the matters aforesaid, and in the judgement of the authority sending the dispatch is of a nature to require secrecy, it may be marked 'Secret' by the authority sending it; and a dispatch so marked is not to be communicated to the members of the Council of India unless the Secretary of State so directs.

[33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 22, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 28.]

(*a*) See note on s. 10.

(b) The Act of 1784 (24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25), which constituted the Board of Control, directed that a committee of secrecy, consisting of not more than three members, should be formed out of the directors of the Company, and, when the Board of Control issued orders requiring secrecy, the committee of secrecy was to transmit the orders to India, without informing the other directors. (See above p. 63.) These directions were reproduced by the Charter Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 19, 20), and by the Charter Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 35, 36). The Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 27), directed that orders which formerly went through the secret committee need not be communicated to the council, unless they were orders for which a majority of votes of the council was required. There are similar provisions as to dispatches from India. 'Secret' orders are usually communicated to the Political and Secret Committee of the council. (See above, s. II.)

Signature and address of orders, &c. [21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 19.] **15.—(1)** Every order or communication sent to India, and [save as expressly provided by this Digest] every order made in the United Kingdom in relation to the government of India under this Act, must be signed by the Secretary of State (a).

(2) Every dispatch from the Governor-General in Council or from the Governor in Council of Madras or of Bombay must be addressed to the Secretary of State (b).

(a) This reproduces the existing enactment, but of course applies only to official orders and communications. It is not clear to what provisions (if any) the saving refers.

(b) This recognizes the right of the Governments of Madras and Bombay to communicate directly with the Secretary of State, a right derived from a time when Madras and Bombay constituted independent presidencies together with the Presidency of Bengal, and before a general Government of India had been established.

Communica-
tion to
Parlia-
ment as
to orders
for com-
mencing
hostilities.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 54.] **16.** When any order is sent to India directing the actual commencement of hostilities by His Majesty's forces in India, the fact of the order having been sent must, unless the order has in the meantime been revoked or suspended, be communicated to both Houses of Parliament within three months after the sending of the order, or, if Parliament is not sitting at the expiration of those three months, then within one month after the next meeting of Parliament (a).

(a) See also s. 24.

Corre-
spondence
by **17.** It is the duty of the Governor-General in Council to transmit to the Secretary of State constantly and diligently

an exact particular of all advices or intelligence, and of all transactions and matters, coming to the knowledge of the Governor-General in Council and relating to the government, commerce, revenues, or affairs of India (a).

governor-general with Secretary of State.
[13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 9.]

(a) This reproduces an enactment contained in the Regulating Act, 1773, by which Warren Hastings and his successors were directed to correspond regularly with the Court of Directors at home, but its re-enactment would probably not be considered necessary at the present day.

Establishment of Secretary of State.

18.—(1) His Majesty the King may, by Order in Council, fix the establishment of the Secretary of State in Council and the salaries to be paid to the persons on that establishment.

Establishment of the Secretary of State.

(2) Every such order must be laid as soon as may be before both Houses of Parliament.

[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, ss. 15, 16.]

(3) No addition may be made to the said establishment, nor to the salaries authorized by any such order, except by a similar Order in Council to be laid in like manner before both Houses of Parliament.

(4) The regulations made by His Majesty for examinations, certificates, probation, or other tests of fitness in relation to appointments to junior situations in the civil service apply to such appointments on the said establishment.

(5) Subject to the foregoing provisions of this section, the Secretary of State in Council may make all appointments to and promotions in the said establishment, and remove any officer or servant belonging to the establishment (a).

(a) This is the enactment by which the staff of the India Office is regulated.

19. His Majesty may by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual, countersigned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, grant to any secretary, officer, or servant appointed on the establishment of the Secretary of State in Council such compensation, superannuation, or retiring allowance as may be granted to persons on the establishment of a Secretary of State under the laws for the time being in force concerning

Pensions.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 18.]

superannuations and other allowances to persons having held civil offices in the public service (a).

(a) This gives the staff of the India Office pensions on the civil service scale, i. e. one-sixtieth of annual salary for each year of service, subject to certain conditions and restrictions.

Indian Appointments.

Indian
appoint-
ments.

[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, ss.
33, 35-
23 & 24
Vict.
c. 100,
s. 1.]

20.—(1) In any regulations for the time being in force for the organization of the Indian Army provision must be made for the benefit of the sons of persons who have served in India in the military or civil service of the Crown or of the East India Company equally advantageous with those which were in force before the twentieth day of August one thousand eight hundred and sixty, and the selection of such persons is to be in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary of State (a).

[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 37.]

(2) Except as provided by this Digest, all powers of making regulations in relation to appointments and admissions to service and other matters connected therewith, and of altering or revoking such regulations, which, if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed, might have been exercised by the Court of Directors or Commissioners for the Affairs of India, may be exercised by the Secretary of State in Council.

(a) Sections 33, 34, 35, and 36 of the Government of India Act, 1858, run as follows :—

‘ 33. All appointments to cadetships, naval and military, and all admissions to service not herein otherwise expressly provided for, shall be vested in Her Majesty ; and the names of persons to be from time to time recommended for such cadetships and service shall be submitted to Her Majesty by the Secretary of State.

‘ 34. Regulations shall be made for admitting any persons, being natural-born subjects of Her Majesty (and of such age and qualifications as may be prescribed in this behalf), who may be desirous of becoming candidates for cadetships in the engineers and in the artillery, to be examined as candidates accordingly, and for prescribing the branches of knowledge in which such candidates shall be examined, and generally for regulating and conducting such examinations.

‘ 35. Not less than one-tenth of the whole number of persons to be recommended in any year for military cadetships (other than cadetships in the engineers and artillery) shall be selected according to such

regulations as the Secretary of State in Council may from time to time make in this behalf from among the sons of persons who have served in India in the military or civil service of Her Majesty, or of the East India Company.

' 36. Except as aforesaid, all persons to be recommended for military cadetships shall be nominated by the Secretary of State and members of council, so that out of seventeen nominations the Secretary of State shall have two, and each member of council shall have one; but no person so nominated shall be recommended unless the nomination be approved of by the Secretary of State in Council.'

When the Government of India Act, 1858, passed, and for some years afterwards, the Indian Army (taking European and Native together) was officered in two ways. A certain number of cadets were appointed to Addiscombe, and thence, according to their success in passing the college examination, went to India in the engineers, artillery, or infantry. Others received direct cadetships, and went to India without previous training. The Act speaks of both classes alike as receiving cadetships. But the artillery and engineers were not in practice taken into account in calculating the one-tenth under s. 35. This being so, the effect of s. 35 was, roughly speaking, that one-tenth of the officers appointed to the Indian Army (exclusive of the engineers and artillery) must be the sons of Indian servants.

The Act of 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 100), which abolished the European Army, and which was passed on August 20, 1860, provided that 'the same or equal provision for the sons of persons who have served in India shall be maintained in any plan for the reorganization of the Indian Army.' The mode of appointment to the Native Army was meantime altered. In pursuance of this provision, an order was issued in 1862, under which the Secretary of State makes appointments to cadetships at Sandhurst, fixed at twenty annually, limited to the sons of Indian servants. The expenses of these cadets are borne by India, if their pecuniary circumstances are such as to justify the payment. Regulations as contemplated by s. 35 of the Government of India Act, 1858, have been made governing the selection, and are rigidly followed. These cadetships differ from the old ones in that they are not directly and necessarily connected with the Indian Army, for a cadet might pass from Sandhurst into the British Army and not into the staff corps. But the object is, of course, to supply the Indian Army. The word 'cadet' in the Government of India Act has no express limitation, and the present cadets appear to fall within the meaning of the term. In practice, appointments of cadets do not now go to the King.

Section 34 appears to be spent, and s. 36 to be virtually repealed by the abolition of the Indian Army. The effect of the other two sections, so far as they are in force, is reproduced in the Digest.

21.—(1) His Majesty may, by writing under the Royal Sign Manual, countersigned by the Secretary of State, re-
Powers of Crown and

Secretary of State as to removal of officers. in India. move or dismiss any person holding office under the Crown

[33 Geo.

(2) A copy of any writing under the Royal Sign Manual removing or dismissing any such person must, within eight days after the signature thereof, be communicated to the Secretary of State in Council.

III, c. 52, ss. 35, 36, 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 74, 75, 21 & 22 Vict. c.

106, s. 38.]

(3) Nothing in this enactment affects [any of His Majesty's powers over any officer in the army, or] the power of the Secretary of State in Council [or of any authority in India] to remove or dismiss any such person.

This is an attempt to reproduce the net result of a series of enactments, which are still in the statute book, but the earlier of which were intended to give the Crown power over servants of the East India Company; and, therefore, are not wholly applicable to existing circumstances. The saving words in square brackets do not reproduce any existing enactment, but represent the effect of the law.

The Charter Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52) enacted (ss. 35, 36) that:—

'35. It shall and may be lawful to and for the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, by any writing or instrument under his or their sign manual, countersigned by the president of the Board of Commissioners for the Affairs of India, to remove or recall any person or persons holding any office, employment, or commission, civil or military, under the said united Company in India for the time being, and to vacate and make void all or every or any appointment or appointments, commission or commissions, of any person or persons to any such offices or employments; and that all and every the powers and authorities of the respective persons so removed, recalled, or whose appointment or commission shall be vacated, shall cease or determine at or from such respective time or times as in the said writing or writings shall be expressed and specified in that behalf: Provided always, that a duplicate or copy of every such writing or instrument under His Majesty's sign manual, attested by the said president for the time being, shall, within eight days after the same shall be signed by His Majesty, his heirs or successors, be transmitted or delivered to the chairman or deputy chairman for the time being of the said Company, to the intent that the Court of Directors of the said Company may be apprised thereof.

'36. Provided always, . . . that nothing in this Act contained shall extend or be construed to preclude or take away the power of the Court of Directors of the said Company from removing or recalling any of the officers or servants of the said Company, but that the said court shall and may at all times have full liberty to remove, recall, or dismiss any of such officers or servants at their will and pleasure, in

the like manner as if this Act had not been made, any governor-general, governor, or commander-in-chief appointed by His Majesty, his heirs or successors, through the default of appointment by the said Court of Directors, always excepted, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.'

The Charter Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 74, 75) enacted that—

'74. It shall be lawful for His Majesty by any writing under his sign manual, countersigned by the president of the said Board of Commissioners, to remove or dismiss any person holding any office, employment, or commission, civil or military, under the said Company in India, and to vacate any appointment or commission of any person to any such office or employment.

'75. Provided always, that nothing in this Act contained shall take away the power of the said Court of Directors to remove or dismiss any of the officers or servants of the said Company, but that the said court shall and may at all times have full liberty to remove or dismiss any of such officers or servants at their will and pleasure.'

And finally the Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 38), enacts that :—

'Any writing under the Royal Sign Manual, removing or dismissing any person holding any office, employment, or commission, civil or military, in India, of which, if this Act had not been passed, a copy would have been required to be transmitted or delivered within eight days after being signed by Her Majesty to the chairman or deputy chairman of the Court of Directors, shall in lieu thereof be communicated within the time aforesaid to the Secretary of State in Council.'

The countersignature of the Secretary of State was substituted for the countersignature of the president of the Board of Control by the Government of India Act, 1858. (See above, s. 2.)

The tenure of persons serving under the Government of India, or under a local Government, is presumably tenure during the pleasure of the Crown. In the case of *Grant v. The Secretary of State for India in Council*, L. R. 2 C. P. D. 455 (1877), the plaintiff, formerly an officer in the East India Company's service, appointed in 1840, and subsequently continuing in the Indian Army when the Indian military and naval forces were transferred to the Crown, brought an action against the defendant for damages for being compulsorily placed by the Government upon the pension list, and so compelled to retire from the army. It was held on demurrer that the claim disclosed no cause of action, because the Crown acting by the defendant had a general power of dismissing a military officer at its will and pleasure, and that the defendant could make no contract with a military officer in derogation of this power. In the case of *Shenton v. Smith* (1895), A. C. 229, which was an appeal from the Supreme Court of Western Australia, it was held that a Colonial Government is on the same footing as the Home Government with respect to the employment and dismissal of servants of the Crown, and that these, in the absence of special contract, hold

their offices during the pleasure of the Crown. The respondent in that case, having been gazetted without any special contract to act temporarily as medical officer during the absence on leave of the actual holder of the office, was dismissed by the Government before the leave had expired. It was held that he had no cause of action against the Government. In the case of *Dunn v. The Queen* (1896), 1 Q. B. 116, it was held that servants of the Crown, civil as well as military, except in special cases where it is otherwise provided by law, hold their offices only during the pleasure of the Crown. In this case a petition of right had been presented, and the case set up by the suppliant was that Sir Claude McDonald, Her Majesty's Commissioner and Consul-General for the Niger Protectorate in Africa, acting on behalf of the Crown, had engaged him in the service of the Crown as consular agent in that region for a period of three years certain, and he claimed damages for having been dismissed before the expiration of that period. It appeared that Sir Claude McDonald himself held office only during the pleasure of the Crown. Mr. Justice Day held that contracts for the service of the Crown were determinable at the pleasure of the Crown, and therefore directed a verdict and judgement for the Crown. The decision was upheld by the Court of Appeal. Subsequently Mr. Dunn brought an action against Sir Claude McDonald, presumably for breach of contract, but the action was dismissed, and the doctrine that an agent who makes a contract on behalf of his principal is liable to the other contracting party for a breach of an implied warrant of his authority to enter into the contract was held inapplicable to a contract made by a public servant acting on behalf of the Crown. *Dunn v. McDonald* (1897), 1 Q. B. 401, 555. See *Jehangir v. S. of S. for India*, 1 L. R. 27 Bom. 189; *Voss v. S. of S. for India*, 1 L. R. 33 Cal. 669.

It is the practice for the Secretary of State in Council to make a formal contract with persons appointed in England to various branches of the Government service in India, e. g. education officers, forest officers, men in the Geological Survey, and mechanics and artificers on railways and other works, and many of these contracts contain an agreement to keep the men in the service for a term certain, subject to a right of dismissal for particular causes. Whether and how far the principles laid down in the cases of *Shenton v. Smith* and *Dunn v. The Queen* apply to these contracts, is a question which in the present state of the authorities cannot be considered free from doubt.

Tenure during pleasure is the ordinary tenure of public servants in England, including those who belong to the 'permanent civil service,' and the service of a member of the Civil Service of India is expressly declared by his covenant to continue during the pleasure of His Majesty. Tenure during good behaviour is, subject to a few exceptions (e. g. the auditor of Indian accounts: see below, s. 30), confined to persons holding judicial offices. But judges of the Indian high courts are expressly declared by statute to hold during pleasure: see below, s. 97. The difference between the two forms of tenure is that a person holding during good behaviour cannot be removed from his office

except for such misconduct as would, in the opinion of a court of justice, justify his removal; whilst a person holding during pleasure can be removed without any reason for his removal being assigned. See Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution* (second edition), pt. ii. p. 213. See also *Willis v. Gipps*, 6 State Trials N. S. 311 (1840), as to removal of judicial officers.

PART II.

REVENUES OF INDIA.

22.—(1) The revenues of India are received for and in the name of His Majesty, and may, subject to the provisions embodied in this Digest (*a*), be applied for the purposes of the government of British India alone.

(2) There are to be charged on the revenues of India alone

(*a*) all the debts of the East India Company; and

(*b*) all sums of money, costs, charges, and expenses which, if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed, would have been payable by the East India Company out of the revenues of India in respect of any treaties, covenants, contracts, grants, or liabilities existing at the commencement of that Act; and

(*c*) all expenses, debts, and liabilities lawfully contracted and incurred on account of the government of India (*b*); and

(*d*) all payments under the Government of India Act, 1858.

(3) For the purposes of this Digest the revenues of India include—

(*a*) all the territorial and other revenues of or arising in British India; and

(*b*) all tributes and other payments in respect of any territories which would have been receivable by or in the name of the East India Company if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed; and

(*c*) all fines and penalties incurred by the sentence or order of any court of justice in British India, and all forfeitures for crimes of any movable or immovable property (*b*) in British India; and

Application of
revenues.
116 & 117
Vict. c. 93.
11 & 27.
21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, 107, 2.
42-1
21 & 22
Vict. c.
106.

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1897 (June). Jubilee celebrations in England.	1896-7. Famine in India. 1897 (April 9). Legislative Council established for Punjab. Burma constituted a Lieutenant-Governorship, with a Legislative Council. (June 12.) Earthquake in Bengal. War on North-Western frontier.
1899 (October 11). Boer War commenced: ended May 31, 1902.	1898. Appearance of plague at Calcutta and in Madras. Famine Commission. 1899 (January 6). Lord Curzon, Viceroy.
1901 (January 22). Death of Queen Victoria. (January 24.) Proclamation of King Edward VII.	1899-1900. Recurrence of famine in India. 1901 (October). Death of Amir Abdur Rahman of Afghanistan. Punitive operations against Mahsud Waziris. (November.) Constitution of the North-West frontier Province under a Chief Commissioner.
1902 (August 9.) Coronation. (January 30). Anglo-Japanese Treaty signed. (July.) Mr. Balfour, Prime Minister.	1902. 'North-Western Provinces and Oudh' renamed 'United Provinces of Agra and Oudh.' 1902-3. Indian Police Commission. 1903 (January). Delhi Durbar. (October.) Incorporation of Berar with the Central Provinces.
1904 (February 8). Russo-Japanese War commenced: ended September 5, 1905; Peace Treaty signed at Portsmouth, U.S.A. Anglo-French Agreement signed.	1903-4. Mission to Tibet. 1904. Indian Universities Act. 1904-5. Mission to Cabul.
1905 (August 12). Anglo-Japanese Treaty signed. (November.) Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Prime Minister.	1905 (March). Constitution of Railway Board in India. (April 4.) Earthquake in Punjab. Reorganization of Military Department of the Government of India: creation of Army and Military Supply Departments. Eastern Bengal and Assam constituted a separate administration under a Lieutenant-Governor with a Legislative Council. (November 18.) Lord Minto, Viceroy.

(d) all movable or immovable property (c) in British India escheating or lapsing for want of an heir or successor (d), and all property in British India devolving as *bona vacantia* for want of a rightful owner.

(4) All other money vested in, or arising or accruing from property or rights vested in, His Majesty under the Government of India Act, 1858, or to be received or disposed of by the Secretary of State in Council under that Act, must be applied in aid of the revenues of India.

(a) The qualification refers to s. 34, under which there is power to dispose of escheated property.

(b) See *Shivabhojan v. Secretary of State for India*, I. L. R. 28 Bom 314, 321.

(c) The expression in the Act is 'real or personal estate,' but 'movable or immovable property' is more intelligible in India, where the terms are defined by the General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (25), (34)).

(d) As to the circumstances under which property in India may escheat or lapse to the Crown, see *Collector of Masulipatam v. Chavaly Vencata Narrainapah*, 8 Moore Ind. App. 500; and *Ranee Sonet Kowar v. Mirza Humut Bahadoor*, L. R. 3 I. A. 92.

Control of
Secretary
of State
over ex-
penditure
of reve-
nues.

[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 41.]

23. The expenditure of the revenues of India, both in India and elsewhere, is subject to the control of the Secretary of State in Council, and no grant or appropriation of any part of those revenues, or of any other property coming into the possession of the Secretary of State in Council by virtue of the Government of India Act, 1858, may be made without the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India.

This section of the Act of 1858 has given rise to questions as to the relations between the Secretary of State and his council, and between the Secretary of State in Council and the Government of India.

On the first question there was an important debate in the House of Lords on April 29, 1869 (Hansard, 195, pp. 1821-1846), in which the Marquis of Salisbury and the Duke of Argyll took part, and which was made remarkable by a difference of opinion between high legal authorities on the construction of this section, one view, the stricter, being maintained by Lord Cairns and Lord Chelmsford, and a different view by the then Lord Chancellor, Lord Hatherley. The discussion showed that whilst the object, and to some extent the effect, of this section was to impose a constitutional restraint on the powers of the Secretary of State with respect to the expenditure of money, yet this restraint could not be effectively asserted in all cases, especially where

Imperial questions were involved. For instance, the power to make war necessarily involves expenditure of revenues, but is a power for the exercise of which the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the council cannot be made a necessary condition. The Secretary of State is a member of the Cabinet, and in Cabinet questions the decision of the Cabinet must prevail.

As to the second point, questions have been raised as to the powers of the Indian Legislature to appropriate by Indian Acts to specific objects, provincial or Imperial, sources of income, such as ferry fees and other tolls, process fees, rates on land, licence taxes, and income taxes. But a strict view of the enactment in the Act of 1858 would be inconsistent with the general course of Indian legislation, and would give rise to inconveniences in practice.

24. Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of His Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India are not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, applicable to defraying the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of those possessions by His Majesty's forces charged upon those revenues.

As to the object and effect of this enactment, and in particular as to whether it requires the consent of Parliament to be obtained before war is commenced, see Hansard, 151, July 19, 23, 1858 (Debates on passing of Government of India Act); Hansard, 240, May 20, 21, 24, 1878 (Employment of Indian Troops in Malta); Hansard, 243, December 16, 17, 1878 (Afghan War); Hansard, 272, 273, July 27, 31, 1885 (Egypt); Hansard, 295, March 5, 9, 16, 1885 (Soudan); Hansard, 322, pp. 322-347, January 25, 1886 (Annexation of Upper Burma); July 6, 1896 (Soudan); April 13, 1904 (Tibet); Correspondence as to incidence of cost of Indian troops when employed out of India, 1896 (L. 8131); Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, Part ii. p. 301 (second edition). See also s. 16 of this Digest.

25.—(1) Such parts of the revenues of India as are remitted to the United Kingdom, and all money arising or accruing to the United Kingdom from any property or rights vested in His Majesty for the purposes of the government of India, from the sale or disposal thereof, must be paid to the Secretary of State in Council, to be applied for the purposes of the Government of India Act, 1858.

(2) All such revenues and money must be paid into the Bank of England to the credit of an account entitled 'The account of the Secretary of State in Council of India.'

Restriction on application of revenues to military operations beyond the frontier.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 50.]

Accounts of Secretary of State with Bank.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, ss. 13, 14, 22 & 23, 41, 42 & 43, 44, 45, 46.]

Imperial questions were involved. For instance, the power to make war necessarily involves expenditure of revenues, but is a power for the exercise of which the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the council cannot be made a necessary condition. The Secretary of State is a member of the Cabinet, and in Cabinet questions the decision of the Cabinet must prevail.

As to the second point, questions have been raised as to the powers of the Indian Legislature to appropriate by Indian Acts to specific objects, provincial or Imperial, sources of income, such as ferry fees and other tolls, process fees, rates on land, licence taxes, and income taxes. But a strict view of the enactment in the Act of 1858 would be inconsistent with the general course of Indian legislation, and would give rise to inconveniences in practice.

24. Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of His Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India are not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, applicable to defraying the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of those possessions by His Majesty's forces charged upon those revenues.

Restriction on application of revenues to military operations beyond the frontier.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 55.]

As to the object and effect of this enactment, and in particular as to whether it requires the consent of Parliament to be obtained before war is commenced, see Hansard, 151, July 19, 23, 1858 (Debates on passing of Government of India Act); Hansard, 240, May 20, 21, 23, 1878 (Employment of Indian Troops in Malta); Hansard, 243, December 16, 17, 1878 (Afghan War); Hansard, 272, 273, July 27, 31, 1882 (Egypt); Hansard, 295, March 5, 9, 16, 1885 (Soudan); Hansard, 302, pp. 322-347, January 25, 1886 (Annexation of Upper Burma), July 6, 1896 (Soudan); April 13, 1904 (Tibet); Correspondence as to incidence of cost of Indian troops when employed out of India, 1896 (C. 8131); Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, Part ii. p. 361 (second edition). See also s. 16 of this Digest.

25.—(1) Such parts of the revenues of India as are remitted to the United Kingdom, and all money arising or accruing in the United Kingdom from any property or rights vested in His Majesty for the purposes of the government of India, or from the sale or disposal thereof, must be paid to the Secretary of State in Council, to be applied for the purposes of the Government of India Act, 1858.

Accounts of Secretary of State with Bank.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, ss. 43, 45, 22 & 23 Vict. c. 41, s. 3.
26 & 27 Vict. c. 73, s. 16.]

(2) All such revenues and money must be paid into the Bank of England to the credit of an account entitled 'The Account of the Secretary of State in Council of India.'

(3) The money placed to the credit of this account is paid out on drafts or orders, either signed by two members of the Council of India and countersigned by the Secretary of State or one of his under secretaries or his assistant under secretary or signed by the accountant-general on the establishment of the Secretary of State in Council or by one of the two senior clerks in the department of that accountant-general and countersigned in such manner as the Secretary of State in Council directs; and any draft or order so signed and countersigned effectually discharges the Bank of England for all money paid thereon.

(4) The Secretary of State in Council may for the payment of current demands keep at the Bank of England such accounts as he deems expedient, and every such account is to be kept in such name and be drawn upon by such person and in such manner as the Secretary of State in Council directs.

(5) There are raised in the books of the Bank of England such accounts as may be necessary in respect of stock vested in the Secretary of State in Council, and any such account is entitled 'The Stock Account of the Secretary of State in Council of India.'

(6) Every account referred to in this section is a public account (a).

(a) This section represents the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1858, as modified by 22 & 23 Vict. c. 41, s. 3, and 26 & 27 Vict. c. 73, s. 16, and by existing practice.

Powers of attorney for sale or purchase of stock and receipt of dividends. [21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 47. 26 & 27 Vict. c. 73, s. 16.]

26. The Secretary of State in Council, by power of attorney executed by two members of the Council of India and countersigned by the Secretary of State or one of his under secretaries, or his assistant under secretary, may authorize all or any of the cashiers of the Bank of England—

(a) to sell and transfer all or any part of any stock standing in the books of the Bank to the account of the Secretary of State in Council; and

(b) to purchase and accept stock on any such account; and

(c) to receive dividends on any stock standing to any such account ;

and by any writing signed by two members of the Council of India and countersigned as aforesaid may direct the application of the money to be received in respect of any such sale or dividend.

Provided that stock may not be purchased or sold and transferred under the authority of any such general power of attorney, except on an order in writing directed to the chief cashier and chief accountant of the Bank of England, and signed and countersigned as aforesaid.

27. All securities held by or lodged with the Bank of England in trust for or on account or on behalf of the Secretary of State in Council may be disposed of, and the proceeds thereof may be applied, as may be authorized by order in writing signed by two members of the Council of India and countersigned by the Secretary of State or one of his under secretaries, or his assistant under secretary, and directed to the chief cashier and chief accountant of the Bank of England.

28.—(1) All powers of issuing securities for money in the United Kingdom which are for the time being vested in the Secretary of State in Council must be exercised by the Secretary of State in Council with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India.

(2) Such securities, other than debentures and bills, as might have been issued under the seal of the East India Company must be issued under the hands of two members of the Council of India and countersigned by the Secretary of State or one of his under secretaries, or his assistant under secretary.

(3) All debentures and bills issued by the Secretary of State in Council must bear the name of one of the under secretaries for India for the time being, and that name may be impressed or affixed by machinery or otherwise in such manner as the Secretary of State in Council directs.

The enactments by which the Secretary of State has from time to time been authorized to borrow under special Acts, or for special purposes, such as railways, are not reproduced here.

Accounts
to be
annually
laid before
Parlia-
ment.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 53.]

29.—(1) (a) The Secretary of State in Council must, within the first fourteen days during which Parliament is sitting next after the first day of May in every year, lay before both Houses of Parliament—

(a) An account for the financial year preceding that last completed of the annual produce of the revenues of British India, distinguishing the same under the respective heads thereof, at each of the several provinces; and of all the annual receipts and disbursements at home and abroad for the purposes of the government of India, distinguishing the same under the respective heads thereof:

(b) The latest estimate of the same for the last financial year:

(c) The amount of the debts chargeable on the revenues of India, with the rates of interest they respectively carry, and the annual amount of that interest:

(d) An account of the state of the effects and credits in each province, and in England or elsewhere, applicable to the purposes of the government of India, according to the latest advices which have been received thereof:

(e) A list of the establishment of the Secretary of State in Council, and the salaries and allowances payable in respect thereof.

(2) If any new or increased salary or pension of fifty pounds a year or upwards has been granted or created within any year in respect of the said establishment (b), the particulars thereof must be specially stated and explained at the foot of the account for that year.

(3) The account must be accompanied by a statement prepared from a detailed report from each province in British India in such form as best exhibits the moral and material

progress and condition of British India in each such province (c).

(a) At some time or other during the session of Parliament, usually towards the end, the House of Commons goes into committee on the East India Revenue Accounts, and the Secretary of State for India or his representative in the House of Commons, on the motion to go into committee, makes a statement in explanation of the accounts of the government of India. The debate which takes place on this statement is commonly described as the Indian Budget Debate. The resolution in committee is purely formal.

(b) The words 'in respect of the said establishment' represent the construction placed in practice on the enactment reproduced by this section.

(c) This is the annual 'moral and material progress report.' A special report is published at the expiration of each period of ten years, giving a very full and interesting account of the general condition of India at that date. The last of these decennial reports was in 1904.

30.—(1) (a) His Majesty may, by warrant under His Royal Sign Manual, countersigned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, appoint a fit person to be auditor of the accounts of the Secretary of State in Council, and authorize that auditor to appoint and remove such assistants as may be specified in the warrant.

Audit of Indian accounts in United Kingdom.
21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 52.
44 & 45 Vict. c. 63, s. 1-1

(2) The auditor examines and audits the accounts of the receipt, expenditure, and disposal in the United Kingdom of all money, stores, and property applicable for the purposes of the Government of India Act, 1858.

(3) The Secretary of State in Council must by the officers and servants of his establishment produce and lay before the auditor all such accounts, accompanied by proper vouchers for their support, and must submit to his inspection all books, papers, and writings having relation thereto.

(4) The auditor has power to examine all such officers and servants in the United Kingdom as he thinks fit in relation to such accounts, and the receipt, expenditure, or disposal of such money, stores, and property, and for that purpose, by writing under his hand, to summon before him any such officer or servant.

(5) The auditor must report to the Secretary of State in Council his approval or disapproval of the accounts aforesaid, with such remarks and observations in relation thereto as he thinks fit, specially noting any case, if such there be, in which it appears to him that any money arising out of the revenues of India has been appropriated to other purposes than those to which they are applicable.

(6) The auditor must specify in detail in his reports all sums of money, stores, and property which ought to be accounted for, and are not brought into account or have not been appropriated, in conformity with the provisions of the law, or which have been expended or disposed of without due authority, and must also specify any defects, inaccuracies, or irregularities which may appear in the accounts, or in the authorities, vouchers, or documents having relation thereto.

(7) The auditor must lay all such reports before both Houses of Parliament, with the accounts of the year to which the reports relate.

(8) The auditor holds office during good behaviour.

(9) There are paid to the auditor and his assistants, out of the revenues of India, such salaries as His Majesty by warrant, signed and countersigned as aforesaid, may direct.

(10) The auditor and his assistants are, for the purposes of superannuation allowance, in the same position as if they were on the establishment of the Secretary of State in Council.

(a) The duties of the India Office auditor as to Indian revenues and expenditure correspond in some respects to the duties of the comptroller and auditor-general with respect to the revenues of the United Kingdom. But the reports of the India Office auditor are not referred to the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons. As to the comptroller and auditor-general, see Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution* (2nd ed.), pp. 338-346.

PART III.

PROPERTY, CONTRACTS, AND LIABILITIES.

31.—(1) The Secretary of State in Council may, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, sell and dispose of any property for the time being vested in His Majesty for the purposes of the government of India, and raise money on any such property by way of mortgage and make the proper assurances for any of those purposes, and purchase and acquire any property.

Power of Secretary of State to sell, mortgage, and buy property.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 40.]

(2) All property acquired in pursuance of this section vests in His Majesty for the service of the government of India.

(3) Any assurance relating to real estate made by the authority of the Secretary of State in Council may be made under the hands and seals of three members of the Council of India.

32.—(1) The Secretary of State in Council may, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, make any contract for the purposes of the Government of India Act, 1858.

Contracts of Secretary of State.
[21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 40. 22 & 23 Vict. c. 41, s. 5. 3 Edw. VII, c. 11.]

(2) Any contract so made may be expressed to be made by the Secretary of State in Council.

(3) Any contract so made, if it is a contract which, if made between private persons, would be by law required to be under seal, may be made, varied, or discharged under the hands and seals of two members of the Council of India.

(4) Any contract so made which, if it were made between private persons, would be by law required to be signed by the party to be charged therewith, may be made, varied, or discharged under the hands of two members of the Council of India.

(5) The benefit and liability of every contract made in pursuance of this section passes to the Secretary of State in Council for the time being.

(6) Every contract for or relating to the manufacture, sale, purchase, or supply of goods, or for or relating to affreightment or the carriage of goods, or to insurance, may be entered into, made, and signed on behalf of the Secretary of State by any person upon the permanent establishment of the Secretary of State, duly empowered by the Secretary of State in this behalf, subject to such rules and restrictions as the Secretary of State prescribes. Contracts so entered into, made, and signed are as valid and effectual as if entered into as prescribed by the foregoing provisions of this section. Particulars of all contracts so entered into as aforesaid must be laid before the Secretary of State in such manner and form and within such times as the Secretary of State prescribes.

33.—(1) The Governor-General in Council and any local Government (a) may, on behalf and in the name of the Secretary of State in Council, and subject to such provisions or restrictions as the Secretary of State in Council, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, prescribes, sell and dispose of any movable or immovable property (b) whatsoever in India, within the limits of their respective governments, for the time being vested in His Majesty for the purposes of the government of India, or raise money on any such property by way of mortgage, and make proper assurances for any of these purposes and purchase or acquire any property, movable or immovable (b), in India within the said respective limits, and make any contract for the purposes of the Government of India Act, 1858 (c).

(2) Every assurance and contract made for the purposes of this section must be executed in such manner as the Governor-General in Council by resolution (d) directs or authorizes, and if so executed may be enforced by or against the Secretary of State in Council for the time being.

(3) Neither the Secretary of State nor any member of the Council of India, nor any person executing any such assurance

Power to
execute
assur-
ances, &c.,
in India.
[22 & 23
Vict. c. 41,
ss. 1, 2.
33 & 34
Vict. c.
59, s. 2.]

GOVERNORS-GENERAL OF FORT WILLIAM IN BENGAL¹.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1774. Warren Hastings (Governor of Bengal from 1772). | 1805. Sir George Barlow (temporary, October 10, 1805, to July 31, 1807). |
| 1785. Sir J. Macpherson (temporary, February 1, 1785, to September 12, 1786). | 1807. Lord Minto. |
| 1786. Lord Cornwallis. | 1813. Lord Moira (Marquis of Hastings). |
| 1793. Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth). | 1823. John Adam (temporary, January 9 to August 1, 1823). |
| 1798. Sir Alured Clarke (temporary, March 6 to May 18, 1798). | 1823. Lord Amherst. |
| 1798. Earl of Mornington (Marquis Wellesley). | 1828. W. B. Bayley (temporary, March 13 to July 4, 1828). |
| 1805. Lord Cornwallis (took office July 30, died October 5). | 1828. Lord William Bentinck. |

GOVERNORS-GENERAL OF INDIA.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 1834. Lord William Bentinck. | 1842. Lord Ellenborough. |
| 1835. Sir Charles Metcalfe (temporary, March 20, 1835, to March 4, 1836). | 1844. Sir Henry (Lord) Hardinge. |
| 1836. Lord Auckland. | 1848. Lord Dalhousie. |
| | 1856. Lord Canning. |

VICEROYS AND GOVERNORS-GENERAL

(FROM NOV. 1, 1858).

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1858. Lord Canning (continued as Viceroy). | 1880. Lord Ripon. |
| 1862. Lord Elgin. | 1884. Lord Dufferin. |
| 1864. Sir John (Lord) Lawrence. | 1888. Lord Lansdowne. |
| 1869. Lord Mayo. | 1894. Lord Elgin. |
| 1872. Lord Northbrook. | 1899. Lord Curzon. |
| 1876. Lord Lytton. | 1905. Lord Minto. |

PRESIDENTS OF THE BOARD OF CONTROL.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1784. Lord Sydney. | 1806 (July 26). Thomas Grenville. |
| 1790. W. W. Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville). | 1806 (October 1). George Tierney. |
| 1793. Henry Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville). | 1807. Robert Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville). |
| 1801. Lord Lewisham (afterwards Dartmouth). | 1809 (July). Lord Harrowby. |
| 1802. Lord Castlereagh. | 1809 (November). Robert Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville). |
| 1806 (February 12). Lord Minto. | 1812. Earl of Buckinghamshire. |
| | 1816. George Canning. |

¹ For more minute particulars as to dates see the India List.

or contract, is personally liable in respect thereof, but all liabilities in respect of any such assurance or contract are borne by the revenues of India.

(4) All property acquired in pursuance of this section vests in His Majesty for the service of the government of India.

(a) The words 'or any officer for the time being entrusted with the government, charge, or care of any presidency, province, or district' have been construed in practice as including only lieutenant-governors and chief commissioners, and not 'district officers' in the special India sense. They are, therefore, represented in the Digest by the expression 'local Government,' as defined by s. 124 of the Digest.

(b) The words in the Act are 'real or personal estate.'

(c) Soon after the passing of the Government of India Act, 1858, it became necessary to legislate for the purpose of determining how contracts on behalf of the Secretary of State in Council were to be made in India. Before that Act it had been held that contracts made in England by the East India Company as a governing power could only be made under seal (*Gibson v. East India Company*, 5 Bing. N. C. 262). In India, at least in the presidency towns, certain documents required sealing for the purpose of legal validity. The real seal of the Company was in England, but copies were kept in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and documents sealed with these copies were generally accepted as sealed by the Company. Contracts not under seal were made in India on behalf of the Company by various officials. The transfer of the powers of the Company to the Secretary of State in Council disturbed all these arrangements, and the Government of India Act, 1859 (22 & 23 Vict. c. 41), was accordingly passed for determining the officers by whom, and the mode in which, contracts on behalf of the Secretary of State in Council were to be executed in India. The Act was amended by the East India Contracts Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 59).

(d) See the resolution of the Government of India in the Home Department of March 28, 1895, specifying the officers by whom particular classes of instruments may be executed.

34. The Governor-General in Council, and any other person authorized by any Act passed in that behalf by the Governor-General in Council, may make any grant or disposition of any property in India accruing to His Majesty by forfeiture, escheat, or otherwise, to or in favour of any relative or connexion of the person from whom the property has accrued, or to or in favour of any other person.

As to escheat, see note (c) on s. 22 above.

Power to
dispose of
escheated
property,
&c.
[16 & 17
Vict. c.
15, 3. 27.]

Rights
and lia-
bilities of
Secretary
of State in
Council.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, ss.
65, 68.
22 & 23
Vict. c.
41, s. 6.]

35.—(1) The Secretary of State in Council may sue and be sued as well in India as in England by the name of the Secretary of State in Council, as a body corporate (a).

(2) Every person has the same remedies against the Secretary of State in Council as he might have had against the East India Company if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed (b).

(3) The property and effects for the time being vested in His Majesty for the purposes of the government of India, or acquired for those purposes, are liable to the same judgments and executions as they would have been liable to in respect of liabilities lawfully incurred by the East India Company if the Government of India Act, 1858, had not been passed.

(4) Neither the Secretary of State nor any member of the Council of India is personally liable in respect of any contract entered into or other liability incurred by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of State in Council in his or their official capacity, nor in respect of any contract, covenant, or engagement of the East India Company, but all such liabilities, and all costs and damages in respect thereof, are borne by the revenues of India.

(a) Although the Secretary of State is a body corporate, or in the same position as a body corporate, for the purpose of contracts, and of suing and being sued, yet he is not a body corporate for the purpose of holding property. Such property as formerly vested, or would have vested, in the East India Company, now vests in the Crown. See the remarks of James, L. J., in *Kinlock v. Secretary of State in Council* (1880), L. R. 15 Ch. D. 1. The Secretary of State in Council has privileges in respect of debts due to him in India similar to those of the Crown in respect of Crown debts in England (*The Secretary of State for India v. Bombay Landing and Shipping Company*, 5 Bom. H. C. Rep. O. C. J. 23).

(b) An action does not lie against the Crown in England. The only legal remedy of a subject against the Crown in England is by petition of right.

Until 1874 it was doubtful whether a petition of right would lie except for restitution of property detained by the Crown. But in that year it was decided that a petition would lie for damages for breach of contract (*R. v. Thomas*, L. R. 10 Q. B. 31); and that decision has been followed in subsequent cases. A petition of right does not

lie for a tort except where the wrong complained of is detention of property, the reason alleged being the maxim that the king can do no wrong. For a wrong done by a person in obedience or professed obedience to the Crown the remedy is against the wrongdoer himself and not against his official superior, because the ultimate superior, the Crown, is not liable. See Clode, *Law and Practice of Petition of Right*, and *R. v. Lords Commissioners of the Treasury*, 7 Q. B. 387, and *Raleigh v. Goschen*, [1898] 1 Ch. 73.

A petition of right does not lie in respect of property detained or a contract broken in India.

In the case of *Frith v. Reg.*, L. R. 7 Ex. 365 (1872), the suppliant, by petition of right, sought to recover from the Crown a debt alleged to have become due to the person whom he represented from the Sovereign of Oudh, before that province was annexed in 1856 to the territories of the East India Company. But it was held that, assuming the East India Company became liable to pay the debt by reason of the annexation of the province, the Secretary of State for India in Council, and not the Crown, was, under the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1858, the person against whom the suppliant must seek his remedy, and that consequently a petition of right would not lie. It was pointed out that the remedy by petition of right was inapplicable, as it was plain that the revenues of England could not be liable to pay the claim, and that consequently a judgement for the suppliant would be barren. See also *Doss v. The Secretary of State for India in Council*, L. R. 19 Ex. 509, and *Reiner v. Marquis of Salisbury*, L. R. 2 Ch. D. 378.

Under the enactments reproduced by this section there is a statutory remedy against the Secretary of State in Council, and that remedy is not confined to the classes of cases for which a petition of right would lie in England. See the judgement of Sir Barnes Peacock, C. J., in the case of the *P. & O. Company v. Secretary of State for India in Council* (1861), 2 Bourke 166; 5 Bom. H. C. R. Appendix A; and Mayne's *Criminal Law of India*, pp. 290 sqq. On the other hand it would appear that, apart from special statutory provisions, the only suits which could have been brought against the East India Company, and which can be brought against the Secretary of State in Council as successor of the Company, are suits in respect of acts done in the conduct of undertakings which might be carried on by private individuals without sovereign powers. See *Nobin Chunder Dey v. The Secretary of State for India*, 1 L. R. 1 Cal. 11 (1875); *Jhangir M. Cursetji v. Secretary of State for India in Council* (1902), 1 L. R. 27 Bom. 189; *Shivabhai v. Secretary of State for India*, 1 L. R. 28 Bom. 314.

A suit or action against the Secretary of State in Council may sometimes be met by the plea that the act complained of falls within the category of 'acts of State,' and accordingly cannot be questioned by a municipal court. A plea of this kind was raised successfully in several cases by the East India Company with respect to proceedings taken by them, not in their character of trading company but in their

character of territorial sovereigns. (As to the distinction between these two characters, see *Gibson v. East India Company* (1830), 5 Bing. N. C. 262; *Raja of Coorg v. East India Company* (1800), 29 Beav. 300, at p. 308; and the cases noted below.) And the principles laid down in these cases have been followed in the case of similar proceedings against the Secretary of State in Council.

The question whether the East India Company were acting as a sovereign power or as a private company was raised in *Moodalay v. The East India Company* (1785), 1 Bro. C. C. 400 (referred to in *Prisleau v. United States* (1800), L. R. 2 Eq. 659), but the first reported case in which the Company successfully raised the defence that they were acting as sovereigns, and that the acts complained of were 'acts of State,' appears to have been *The Nabob of the Carnatic v. East India Company* (1793), 1 Ves. Jr. 371; 2 Ves. Jr. 56; 3 Bro. C. C. 292; 4 Bro. C. C. 100. This was a suit for an account brought by the Nabob of Arcot against the East India Company. On the hearing it appeared by the Company's answer that the subject-matter of the suit was a matter of political treaty between the Nabob and the Company, the Company having acted throughout the transaction in their political capacity, and having been dealt with by the Nabob as if they were an independent sovereign. On this ground the bill was dismissed.

The same principle was followed in the case of *The East India Company v. Syed Ally* (1827), 7 Moo. Ind. App. 555, where it was held that the resumption by the Madras Government of a 'jaghire' granted by former Nawabs of the Carnatic before the date of cession to the East India Company and the regrant by the Madras Government to another, was such an act of sovereign power as precluded the Courts from taking cognizance of the question in a suit by the heirs of the original grantee.

The case of *Bedreechand v. Elphinstone* (1830), 2 State Trials, N. S. 379; 1 Knapp P. C. 316, raised the question as to the title to booty taken at Poonah, and alleged to be the property of the Peishwa. It was held that the transaction having been that of a hostile seizure made, if not *flagrante* yet *nondum cessante bello*, a municipal court had no jurisdiction to adjudge on the subject; and that if anything had been done amiss, recourse could be had only to the Government for redress. This decision was followed in *Es pte. D. F. Marais* (1902), A. C. 109.

In the Tanjore case, *Secretary of State in Council of India v. Kamachee Boye Sahaba* (1859), 13 Moo. P. C. 22, a bill was filed on the equity side of the Supreme Court of Madras to establish a claim as private property to certain property of which the Government had taken possession, and for an account. The acts in question had been done on behalf of the Government by a commissioner appointed by them in connexion with the taking over of Tanjore on the death of the Raja Sivaji without heirs. It was held that as the seizure was made by the British Government, acting as a sovereign Power, through its delegate, the East India Company, it was an act of State, to inquire into the propriety of which a municipal court had no jurisdiction. Lord Kingsdown,

in delivering judgement, remarked that 'the general principle of law could not, with any colour of reason, be disputed. The transactions of independent States between each other are governed by other laws than those which municipal courts administer. Such courts have neither the means of deciding what is right nor the power of enforcing any decision which they make.' It was held that the act complained of fell within this principle. 'Of the propriety or justice of that act,' remarked Lord Kingsdown, 'neither the Court below nor the Judicial Committee have the means of forming, or the right of expressing if they had formed, any opinion. It may have been just or unjust, politic or impolitic, beneficial or injurious, taken as a whole, to those whose interests are affected. These are considerations into which their lordships cannot enter. It is sufficient to say that, even if a wrong has been done, it is a wrong for which no municipal court of justice can afford a remedy.'

In the Coorg case, *Raja of Coorg v. East India Company* (1860), 29 Beav. 300, the East India Company had made war against the Raja of Coorg, annexed his territory, and taken his property, including some of the Company's notes. The raja filed a bill against the East India Company, but it was held that the Company had acted in their sovereign capacity, and the bill was dismissed.

In the Delhi case, *Raja Salig Ram v. Secretary of State for India in Council* (1872), L. R. Ind. App. Supp. Vol., p. 119, the question was as to the validity of the seizure, after the Indian Mutiny, of estates formerly belonging to the titular King of Delhi. Here also it was held that the seizure was an act of State, and as such was not to be questioned in a municipal court.

In *Sirdar Bhagwan Singh v. Secretary of State for India in Council* (1874), L. R. 2 Ind. App. Cas. 38, an estate belonging to a former chief in the Punjab had been seized by the Crown, and the question was whether it had been so seized in right of conquest or by virtue of a legal title, such as lapse or escheat. It was held that the seizure had been made in right of conquest, and as such must be regarded as an act of State, and was not liable to be questioned in a municipal court.

Forester and others v. Secretary of State for India in Council (1872), L. R. Ind. App. Supp. Vol., p. 10, is a case on the other side of the line. In this case the Government of India had, on the death of Begum Sumroo, resumed property formerly belonging to her, and the legality of their action was questioned by her heirs. It appeared that the Begum had very nearly, but not quite acquired the position of a petty Indian sovereign, but that she was a British subject at the time of her death, and that the seizure in question was not the seizure, by arbitrary power, of territories which up to that time belonged to another sovereign State, but was the resumption, under colour of a legal title, of lands previously held from the Government by a subject under a particular tenure, on the alleged determination of that tenure; and that consequently the questions raised by the suit were recognizable by a municipal court.

Doss v. Secretary of State for India in Council (1875), L. R. 10 Eq. 509, was a case arising out of the extinction of a sovereign power in India, though not in consequence of hostilities. It was a suit brought in the English Court of Chancery by creditors of the late King of Oudh against the Secretary of State as his successor. It was held that as the debt had been incurred by the late king in his capacity as sovereign, and could not have been enforced against him as a legal claim, it did not, upon the annexation of the kingdom of Oudh, become a legal obligation upon the East India Company, and therefore was not, by the Act of 1858, transferred as a legal obligation against the Secretary of State; and on this ground a demurrer to the bill was allowed.

In the case of *Grant v. Secretary of State for India in Council* (1877), 2 C. P. D. 445; 46 L. J. C. 681, a demurrer was allowed to an action by an officer of the East India Company's service who had been compulsorily retired under the order of the Government of India. Here the plaintiff was clearly a British subject, but nothing turned upon this. For the order was held, as an act of administration in the public service, to be within the high powers of government formerly entrusted to the East India Company (not as a trading company, but as a subordinate (Government) and now to be exercised by the Government of India. In effect the question was not of a sovereign act, but of the powers of high (but still subordinate) officers of Government.

In *Kindock v. Secretary of State for India* (1879), L. R. 15 Ch. D. 1 and 7 App. Cas. 619, which was one of the Banda and Kirwee cases, it was held that a royal warrant granting booty of war to the Secretary of State for India in Council in trust to distribute amongst the persons found entitled to share it by the decree of the Court of Admiralty, did not operate as a transfer of property, or create a trust, and that the defendant, being merely the agent of the sovereign, was not liable to account to any of the parties found entitled.

In *Walker v. Baird*, [1892] App. Cas. 491, which was an appeal to the Privy Council from the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, it was held that the plea of 'act of State,' in the sense of an act, the justification of which on constitutional grounds cannot be inquired into, cannot be admitted between British subjects in a British colony. In this case the plaintiff complained of interference with his lobster factory, and the defendant, a captain of one of Her Majesty's ships, pleaded that he was acting in the execution of his duty, in carrying out an agreement between the Queen and the Republic of France. But the defence was not allowed.

In *Cook v. Sprigg*, [1899] A. C. 572, it was held that grantees of concessions made by the paramount chief of Pondoland could not, after the annexation of Pondoland by the Queen, enforce against the Crown the privileges and rights conferred by the concessions. The language used in the Tanjore case was quoted with approval.

In *West Rand Central Gold Mining Company Limited v. The King*, [1905] 2 K. B. 391, it was held, on demurrer to a petition of right, that damages could not be recovered against the Crown in respect of gold

'commandeered' by the Boer Government before the annexation of the Transvaal.

The facts in Duleep Singh's case, *Salaman v. Secretary of State for India in Council*, [1905] 1 K. B. 613, resembled those in the Tanjore case. When the Punjab was annexed, the East India Company confiscated the State property, granted Duleep Singh a pension for life, assumed the custody of his person during his minority, and took possession of his private property. It was held that these were acts of State, and that an action would not lie against the Secretary of State in Council for arrears of the pension and for an account of the personal property.

On 'acts of State,' see further, Mayne, *Criminal Law of India*, pp. 318 sqq., the article 'Act of State' in the *Encyclopædia of the Laws of England*, and the cases collected in the notes on *The Queen v. The Commissioners of the Treasury*, L. R. 7 Q. B. 387, in Campbell's *Ruling Cases*, vol. i. pp. 802 sqq. The notes on Indian cases in that volume have been partially reproduced above. Mr. Harrison Moore's recent essay on *Act of State in English Law* (London, 1906) covers wider ground, and touches on many points in the 'troublesome borderland of law and politics.'

In suits or actions against the Secretary of State for breach of contract of service, regard must also be had to the principles regulating the tenure of servants under the Crown (see note on s. 21 above).

And, finally, the liability of the Secretary of State in Council to be sued does not deprive the Crown of the privileges to which it is entitled by virtue of the prerogative. In *Ganpat Patayji v. Collector of Canara* (1875), 1 L. R. 1 Bom. 7, the priority of Crown debts over attachment was maintained, and West, J., said—'It is a universal rule that prerogative and the advantages it affords cannot be taken away except by the consent of the Crown embodied in statute. This rule of interpretation is well established, and applies not only to the statutes passed by the British, but also to the Acts of the Indian Legislature framed with constant reference to the rules recognized in England.'

As to the legal liability of a colonial governor, Sir W. Anson says—'He can be sued in the courts of the colony in the ordinary form of procedure. Whether the cause of action springs from liabilities incurred by him in his private or in his public capacity, this rule would appear to hold good. Though he represents the Crown he has none of the legal irresponsibility of the sovereign within the compass of his delegated and limited sovereignty.' *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, pt. ii. p. 262. See *Hill v. Bigge*, 3 Moore P. C. 465; *Musgrove v. Pulido*, L. R. 5 App. Cas. 102; *Nireaha Tamaki v. Baker*, App. Cas., [1901] pp. 561, 576.

The procedure in suits against the Government in India is regulated by ss. 416-429 of the Code of Civil Procedure (XIV of 1882).

PART IV.

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL IN COUNCIL.

General Powers of Governor-General in Council.

General powers and duties of Governor-General in Council. [13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 9. 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 39.]

36.—(1) The superintendence, direction, and control of the civil and military government of British India is vested in the Governor-General of India in Council (a).

(2) The Governor-General in Council is required to pay due obedience to all such orders as he may receive from the Secretary of State (b).

(a) It is difficult to reproduce with accuracy enactments which regulated the powers and duties of the Governor-General and his Council in the days of the East India Company.

Section 9 of the Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63) enacts that 'the said governor-general and council' (i.e. the Governor-General and Council of Bengal), 'or the major part of them, shall have . . . power of superintending and controlling the presidencies of Madras, Bombay, and Bencoolen respectively, so far and in so much as that it shall not be lawful for any president and council of Madras, Bombay, or Bencoolen' to make war or treaties without the previous consent of the governor-general and council, except in cases of imminent necessity or of special orders from the Company. See s. 49 of this Digest. Section 39 of the Charter Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85) declared that 'The superintendence, direction, and control of the whole civil and military government of all the said territories and revenues in India shall be and is hereby vested in a governor-general and councillors, to be styled "The Governor-General of India in Council."'

Since India has been placed under the direct government of the Crown the governor-general has also been viceroy, as the representative of the Queen. Lord Canning was the first viceroy.

The Governor-General in Council is often described as the Government of India, a description which is recognized by Indian legislation (X of 1897, s. 3 (22)).

Of course the reproduction of statutory enactments embodied in this Digest is not an exhaustive statement of the powers of the Governor-General in Council. For instance, the powers of the Government of India, as the paramount authority in India, extend beyond the limits of British India.

Again, the Governor-General in Council, as representing the Crown in India, enjoys, in addition to any statutory powers, such of the powers, prerogatives, privileges, and immunities appertaining to the Crown as are appropriate to the case and consistent with the system of law

in force in India. Thus it has been decided that the rule that the Crown is **not** bound by a statute unless expressly named therein applies also in India. See *Secretary of State for India v. Bombay Landing and Shipping Company*, 5 Bom. H. C. Rep. O. C. J. 23; *Ganpat Pataya v. Collector of Canara*, I. L. R. 1 Bom. 7; *The Secretary of State for India v. Matthurabhai*, I. L. R. 14 Bom. 213, 218; *Bell v. Municipal Commissioners for Madras*, I. L. R. 25 Mad. 457. The Governor-General in Council has also, by delegation, powers of making treaties and arrangements with Asiatic States, of exercising jurisdiction and other powers in foreign territory, and of acquiring and ceding territory. See *Damodhar Khan v. Deoram Khanji*, I. L. R. 1 Bom. 367, L. R. 2 App. Cas. 332; *Lachmi Narayan v. Raja Pratap Singh*, I. L. R. 2 All. 1; *Hemchand Devchand v. Azam Sakarlal Chhotamlal and The Taluka of Kotda Sangani v. The State of Gondal*, A. C., [1906] 212, and below, p. 387. Moreover, the Government of India has powers, rights, and privileges derived, not from the English Crown, but from the native **princes** of India, whose rule it has superseded. For instance, the rights of the Government in respect of land and minerals in India are different from the rights of the Crown in respect of land and minerals in England. Whether and in what cases the Governor-General has the prerogative of pardon has been questioned. The power is not expressly conferred on him by his warrant of appointment, but it would be strange if he had **not** a power possessed by all colonial governors. However, the power of remitting sentences under the Code of Criminal Procedure makes the question of little practical importance. As to the prerogatives of the Crown in India and elsewhere, see Chitty, *Prerogatives of the Crown*; Forsyth, *Cases and Opinions*, chap. v; and Campbell's *Ruling Cases*, vol. viii. pp. 150-275.

The Madras and Bombay Armies Act, 1893 (56 & 57 Viet. c. 62), took away the military control and authority previously exercisable by the Governments of Madras and Bombay. As to the power of the governor-general to grant military commissions, see the note below, p. 267.

(b) This reproduces part of s. 9 of the Regulating Act (13 Geo. III, c. 63), which directs that 'the said governor-general and council for the time being shall and they are hereby directed and required to obey all such orders as they shall receive from the Court of Directors of the said united Company.' This enactment was necessary at a time when the relations to be regulated were those between the statutory governor-general and his council on the one hand and the directors of the Company on the other, and, being still on the statute book, is reproduced here. But, of course, the relations between the Secretary of State and the Government of India are now regulated by constitutional usage.

The Governor-General.

37. The Governor-General of India is appointed by His Majesty by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual. The governor-general.

- [21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 29]. The appointment of the governor-general is made on the advice of the Prime Minister.
- The governor-general usually holds office for a term of five years. As to his resignation, see below, s. 82.

The Council of the Governor-General.

38. The council of the Governor-General of India, as constituted for executive purposes, consists of the ordinary members, and of the extraordinary member (a) (if any) thereof (b).

(a) See s. 40.

(b) This section does not reproduce any specific enactment, but represents the existing law.

39.—(1) The ordinary members of the governor-general's council are appointed by His Majesty by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual.

(2) The number of the ordinary members of the governor-general's council is five, or, if His Majesty thinks fit to appoint a sixth member, six (a).

(3) Of the ordinary members of the governor-general's council, three must be persons who at the time of their appointment have been for at least ten years in the service of the Crown in India (b), and one must be a barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates of Scotland, of not less than five years' standing (c).

(4) If any person appointed an ordinary member of the governor-general's council is at the time of his appointment in the military service of the Crown, he may not, during his continuance in office as such member, hold any military command or be employed in actual military duties.

(a) The number is at present six. The power given by 37 & 38 Vict. c. 91 to appoint a sixth member specifically for public works purposes was made a general power by 4 Edw. VII, c. 26. Under existing arrangements the business of the Government of India is distributed between nine departments—Finance, Foreign, Home, Legislative, Revenue and Agriculture, Public Works, Commerce and Industry, Army, Military Supply. Of these the Foreign Department is under the immediate superintendence of the governor-general, and the Army Department is under the commander-in-chief of His Majesty's forces in India (see s. 40 of Digest). The charge of the other departments is distributed between the other members of council.

The term of office of a member of council is by custom five years.

Ordinary
members
of council.

[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 7.
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 3.
32 & 33
Vict. c.
97, s. 8.
37 & 38
Vict. c.
91, s. 1.
4Edw.VII,
c. 26.]

TABLE OF DATES

1821. Charles Bathurst.
 1822. Charles Watkins Williams-Wynn.
 1828 (February). Robert Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville).
 1828 (Sept.). Lord Ellenborough.
 1830. Charles Grant (afterwards Lord Glenelg).
 1834. Lord Ellenborough.
 1835. Sir John Cam Hobhouse.
 1841 (Sept.). Lord Ellenborough.
 1841 (October). Lord Fitzgerald and Vesce.
 1843. Lord Ripon.

1846. Sir John Cam Hobhouse.
 1852 (February 6). Fox Maule (afterwards Lord Panmure and Earl of Dalhousie).
 1852 (February 28). John Charles Herries.
 1852 (December 30). Sir Charles Wood (afterwards Viscount Halifax).
 1855. Robert Vernon Smith (afterwards Lord Lyveden).
 1858 (March 6). Lord Ellenborough.
 1858 (June). Lord Stanley (afterwards Earl of Derby).

SECRETARIES OF STATE FOR INDIA.

1858. Lord Stanley (afterwards Earl of Derby).
 1859. Sir Charles Wood (afterwards Viscount Halifax).
 1866 (February). Lord de Grey and Ripon (afterwards Marquis of Ripon).
 1866 (July). Lord Cranborne (afterwards Marquis of Salisbury).
 1867. Sir Stafford Northcote (afterwards Earl of Iddesleigh).
 1868. Duke of Argyll.
 1874. Lord Salisbury.

1878. Gathorne Hardy (afterwards Earl of Cranbrook).
 1880. Lord Hartington (afterwards Duke of Devonshire).
 1882. Lord Kimberley.
 1885. Lord Randolph Churchill.
 1886 (February). Lord Kimberley.
 1886 (August). Sir Richard Cross (afterwards Lord Cross).
 1892. Lord Kimberley.
 1894. H. H. Fowler (afterwards Sir H. Fowler).
 1895. Lord George Hamilton.
 1903. St. John Brodrick.
 1905. John Morley.

As to leave of absence, resignation, and conditional and temporary appointments, see below, ss. 81-87.

(b) The result of this restriction is that if, as occasionally happens, the member of council in charge of the military supply department (formerly the military department) is not qualified by ten years' service in India, the finance member must, practically, be taken from the Indian Civil Service.

(c) The member of council who is required to hold these qualifications is usually styled the law member. The first holder of the post was Lord Macaulay. He and his successors, down to 1853, were not members of the executive council, and his duties during this period are described by Sir Barnes Peacock in a minute of November 3, 1859, and by Sir H. S. Maine in his minute of May 5, 1860 (Minutes, No. 42). By the Act of 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95) he was placed in the same position as the other ordinary members of the governor-general's council. He is at the head of a department of his own, the Legislative Department, which was formerly a branch of the Home Department, but which was, in pursuance of Sir H. S. Maine's recommendations (see Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 84), constituted a separate department in 1869. The duties of this department, and its relation to the other branches of the Government of India, are regulated by the rules and orders for the transaction of business in the council of the governor-general. Practically, its functions are to prepare the drafts of all legislative measures introduced into the governor-general's council, to consider, and in some cases to settle, the form of regulations submitted under the Government of India Act, 1870 (33 Vict. c. 3), and of the rules and regulations made under powers given by Acts of the governor-general's council, to consider Bills and Acts of the local legislatures with reference to penal clauses and other special points, and to advise other departments of the Government on various legal questions. The law member of council takes charge of most of the Bills introduced into the governor-general's council, and is chairman of the select committees to which those Bills are referred. As to the general nature of his work, see the chapter on Legislation under Lord Mayo, contributed by Sir James FitzJames Stephen to Sir W. W. Hunter's *Life of Lord Mayo* (vol. ii. chap. viii). See also Sir H. S. Maine's Minute of 1868 on Over-legislation (Minutes, No. 204).

40.—(1) The Secretary of State in Council may, if he thinks fit, appoint the commander-in-chief for the time being of His Majesty's forces in India an extraordinary member of the governor-general's council, and in that case the commander-in-chief has rank and precedence in the council next after the governor-general (a).

Extraordinary members of council. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 3, 9.]

(2) When and so long as the governor-general and his council are in any province administered by a governor in

council, the governor of that province is an extraordinary member of the governor-general's council (*b*).

(*a*) In practice, the commander-in-chief is always appointed an extraordinary member of council. Under regulations made in 1905 he is in charge of the army department.

(*b*) In practice, meetings of the governor-general and his council are not held within the presidencies of Madras and Bombay.

Ordinary
and legis-
lative
meet-
ings of
governor-
general's
council.

41.—(1) The governor-general's council hold ordinary meetings, that is to say, meetings for executive purposes; and legislative meetings, that is to say, meetings for the purpose of making laws.

(2) The ordinary and extraordinary members of the governor-general's council are entitled to be present at all meetings thereof.

This section does not reproduce any specific enactment, but represents existing law and practice.

There appears to be no express enactment that the governor-general shall, when present, preside at meetings of his council, but this is implied by such provisions as 24 & 25 Vict. c. 107, s. 7.

Ordinary
meetings
of council.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s.
48.
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 9.]

42.—(1) The ordinary meetings of the governor-general's council are held at such places in India (*a*) as may be appointed by the Governor-General in Council.

(2) At any ordinary meeting of the governor-general's council the governor-general and one ordinary member of his council may exercise all the functions of the Governor-General in Council (*b*).

(*a*) The expression used in the Act of 1861 is 'within the territories of India,' which, perhaps, means British India. In practice, the meetings of the council are held at Calcutta and Simla.

(*b*) The Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 38) directs that 'the Governor-General and councillors of Fort William, and the several governors and councillors of Fort Saint George and Bombay, shall at their respective council boards proceed in the first place to the consideration of such matters as shall be proposed by the governor-general or by the governors of the said presidencies respectively, and as often as any matter or question shall be propounded by any of the said councillors it shall be competent to the said governor-general or governor respectively to postpone and adjourn the discussion thereof to a future day, provided that no such adjournment shall exceed forty-eight hours, nor shall the matter or question so proposed be adjourned more than twice without the consent of the councillor who proposed the same.'

This enactment, though not specifically repealed, is practically superseded by the rules and orders made under the Indian Councils Act, 1861, and therefore is not reproduced in the Digest.

43.—(1) All orders and other proceedings of the Governor-General in Council must be expressed to be made by the Governor-General in Council, and must be signed by a secretary to the Government of India, or otherwise as the Governor-General in Council may direct (a).

(2) The governor-general may make rules and orders for the more convenient transaction of business in his council, other than the business at legislative meetings, and every order made or act done in accordance with such rules and orders must be treated as being the order or the act of the Governor-General in Council.

(a) Under the Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 39) the signature referred to is that of 'the chief secretary to the council of the presidency.'

Under the Act of 1813 (53 Geo. III, c. 155, s. 79) orders or proceedings may be signed either by the chief secretary to the Government of the said presidency, or, in the absence of such chief secretary, by the principal secretary of the department of such presidency to which such orders or proceedings relate.

Under Act II of 1834 of the Indian Legislature, each of the secretaries to the Government of India and to the Government of Fort William in Bengal is declared to be competent to perform all the duties and exercise all the powers which by any Act of Parliament or any regulation then in force were assigned to the chief secretary to the Government of Fort William in Bengal, and each of the secretaries to the Governments of Fort St. George and Bombay is declared to be competent to perform all the duties and exercise all the powers which by any such Act or regulation were assigned to the chief secretaries to the Governments of Fort St. George and Bombay respectively.

Under these circumstances this section of the Digest probably represents the form in which Parliament would re-enact the existing statutory provisions, especially as they are provisions which may be modified by Indian Acts. See 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22.

In practice, orders and proceedings are signed by the secretary of the department to which they relate.

(b) The rules and orders made under this section appear to be treated by the Government of India as confidential, and have not been published. The most important effect of the section has been to facilitate the departmental transaction of business.

Business of Governor-General in Council. [33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 39. 53 Geo. III, c. 155, s. 79. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 8.]

Procedure
in case of
difference
of opinion.
[13 Geo.
III, c. 63,
s. 8.
3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85,
s. 48.]

44.—(1) At any ordinary meeting of the governor-general's council, if any difference of opinion arises on any question brought before the council, the Governor-General in Council is bound by the opinion and decision of the majority of those present, and if they are equally divided the governor-general, or, in his absence, the senior member of the council present, has two votes or the casting vote.

[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
ss. 47, 48,
49-
33 & 34
Vict.
c. 3, s. 5.]

(2) Provided that whenever any measure is proposed before the Governor-General in Council whereby the safety, tranquillity, or interests of British India, or of any part thereof, are or may be, in the judgement of the governor-general, essentially affected, and he is of opinion either that the measure proposed ought to be adopted and carried into execution, or that it ought to be suspended or rejected, and the majority present at a meeting of the council dissent from that opinion, the governor-general may, on his own authority and responsibility, adopt, suspend, or reject the measure in whole or in part.

(3) In every such case any two members of the dissentient majority may require that the adoption, suspension, or rejection of the measure, and the fact of their dissent, be notified to the Secretary of State, and the notification must be accompanied by copies of any minutes which the members of the council have recorded on the subject.

(4) Nothing in this section empowers the governor-general to do anything which he could not lawfully have done with the concurrence of his council.

The Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 8) provides that 'in all cases whatever wherein any difference of opinion shall arise upon any question proposed in any consultation, the said governor-general and council shall be bound and concluded by the opinion and decision of the major part of those present. And if it shall happen that, by the death or removal, or by the absence of any of the members of the said council, such governor-general and council shall be equally divided, then, and in every such case, the said governor-general, or, in his absence, the eldest councillor present, shall have a casting vote, and his opinion shall be decisive and conclusive.'

The Charter Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 48) enacts that 'in every case of difference of opinion at meetings of the said council where there shall be an equality of votes, the said governor-general shall have two votes or the casting vote.'

The difficulties which Warren Hastings encountered in his council under the Act of 1773 are well known, and Lord Cornwallis stipulated, on his appointment, that his hands should be strengthened; accordingly by an Act of 1786 (26 Geo. III, c. 10) the governor-general was empowered in special cases to override the majority of his council and act on his own responsibility. (See above, p. 67.)

The provisions of the Act of 1786 were re-enacted by ss. 47, 48, and 49 of the Charter Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52), which are still in force, and which run as follows:—

'47. And whereas it will tend greatly to the strength and security of the British possessions in India, and give energy, vigour, and dispatch to the measures and proceedings of the executive Government within the respective presidencies, if the Governor-General of Fort William in Bengal and the several governors of Fort Saint George and Bombay were vested with a discretionary power of acting without the concurrence of their respective councils, or forbearing to act according to their opinions, in cases of high importance, and essentially affecting the public interest and welfare, thereby subjecting themselves personally to answer to their country for so acting or forbearing to act: Be it enacted, that when and so often as any measure or question shall be proposed or agitated in the Supreme Council at Fort William in Bengal, or in either of the councils of Fort Saint George and Bombay, whereby the interests of the said united Company, or the safety or tranquillity of the British possessions in India, or in any part thereof, are or may, in the judgement of the governor-general or of the said governors respectively, be essentially concerned or affected, and the said governor-general or such governors respectively shall be of opinion that it will be expedient, either that the measures so proposed or agitated ought to be adopted or carried into execution, or that the same ought to be suspended or wholly rejected, and the several other members of such council then present shall differ in and dissent from such opinion, the said governor-general or such governor and the other members of the council shall and they are hereby directed forthwith mutually to exchange with and communicate in council to each other, in writing under their respective hands (to be recorded at large on their secret consultations), the respective grounds and reasons of their respective opinions; and if after considering the same the said governor-general or such governor respectively, and the other members of the said council, shall severally retain their opinions, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor-general in the Supreme Council of Fort William, or either of the said governors in their respective councils, to make and declare any order (to be signed and subscribed by the said governor-general or by the governor making the same) for suspending or rejecting the measure or question so proposed or agitated, in part

or in whole, or to make and declare such order and resolution for adopting and carrying the measure so proposed or agitated into execution, as the said governor-general or such governors in their respective councils shall think fit and expedient; which said last-mentioned order and resolution so made and declared shall be signed as well by the said governor-general or by the governor so making and declaring the same as by all the other members of the council then present, and shall, by force and virtue of this Act, be as effectual and valid to all intents and purposes as if all the said other members had advised the same or concurred therein; and the said members in council, and all officers civil and military, and all other persons concerned, shall be and they are hereby commanded, authorized, and enjoined to be obedient thereto, and to be aiding and assisting in their respective stations in the carrying the same into execution.

‘48. And . . . that the governor-general or governor who shall declare and command any such order or resolution to be made and recorded without the assent or concurrence of any of the other members of council shall alone be held responsible for the same and the consequences thereof.

‘49. Provided always . . . that nothing in this Act contained shall extend or be construed to extend to give power to the said Governor-General of Fort William in Bengal, or to either of the said governors of Fort Saint George and Bombay respectively, to make or carry into execution any order or resolution which could not have been lawfully made and executed with the concurrence of the councils of the respective Governments or presidencies, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.’

The Government of India Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 5), enacts that ‘Whenever any measure shall be proposed before the Governor-General of India in Council, whereby the safety, tranquillity, or interests of the British possessions in India, or any part thereof, are or may be, in the judgement of the said governor-general, essentially affected, and he shall be of opinion either that the measure proposed might be adopted and carried into execution, or that it ought to be suspended or rejected, and the majority in council then present shall dissent from such opinion, the governor-general may, on his own authority and responsibility, suspend or reject the measure in part or in whole, or adopt and carry it into execution; but in every such case two members of the dissentient majority may require that the said suspension, rejection, or adoption, as well as the fact of their dissent, shall be notified to the Secretary of State for India; and such notification shall be accompanied by copies of the minutes (if any) which the members of the council shall have recorded on the subject.’

This enactment practically supersedes, but does not expressly repeal, the enactments in the Act of 1793, but does not apply to the Governments of Madras and Bombay. It was under the enactment of 1870 that Lord Lytton acted in March, 1879, when he exempted certain imported cotton goods from customs duty.

45.—(1) Whenever the Governor-General in Council declares that it is expedient that the governor-general should visit any part of India, unaccompanied by his council, the Governor-General in Council may appoint some member of the council to be president of the governor-general's council during the time of the visit.

Provision for appointment of president of council. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 6.]

(2) The president of the governor-general's council has, during his term of office, the powers of the governor-general at ordinary meetings of the governor-general's council (a).

(a) The object of this section is to make provision for the current business of Government during the temporary absence of the governor-general. The last occasion on which it was put in force was Lord Dufferin's visit to Burma after the annexation of Upper Burma. In such cases the governor-general retains his own powers under s. 47 (1). This power is not exercised on the occasion of the viceroy's ordinary annual tour.

46. If the governor-general, or the president of the governor-general's council, is obliged to absent himself from any ordinary meeting of the governor-general's council by indisposition, or any other cause, and signifies his intended absence to the council, the senior ordinary (a) member for the time being present at the meeting presides thereat, with the like powers as the governor-general would have had, if present.

Provision for absence of governor-general, or president, from meetings of council. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 7.]

Provided that if the governor-general, or president, is at the time resident at the place where the meeting is assembled, and is not prevented by indisposition from signing any act of council made at the meeting, the act requires his signature; but if he declines or refuses to sign it, the like provisions have effect as in cases where the governor-general, when present, dissents from a majority of the meeting of the council (b).

(a) The word "ordinary" is not in the Act of 1861, but is probably implied.

(b) See s. 44.

47.—(1) In any case where a president of the council may be appointed, the Governor-General in Council may

Powers of governor-general in

(p) 'Any authority in India.' The words of the Act are: 'the Governors of the Presidencies of Fort St. George and Bombay respectively in Council, or the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any presidency or other territory for which a council may be appointed, with power to make laws and regulations by virtue of this Act.'

(q) These were the old limits of the East India Company's charter.

Business
at legisla-
tive meet-
ings.

[24 & 25
Vict. c.

67, s. 19.

55 & 56
Vict. c.

14, s. 2.]

64.—(1) (a) At a legislative meeting of the governor-general's council no business shall be transacted other than the consideration of measures introduced [or proposed to be introduced] (b) into the Council for the purpose of enactment, or the alteration of rules for the conduct of business at legislative meetings.

(2) At a legislative meeting of the governor-general's council no motion shall be entertained other than a motion for leave to introduce a measure into the council for the purpose of enactment, or having reference to a measure introduced [or proposed to be introduced] (b) into the council for that purpose, [or having reference to some rule for the conduct of business] (b).

(3) It shall not be lawful, without the previous sanction of the governor-general, to introduce at any legislative meeting of the governor-general's council any measure affecting—

(a) The public debt or public revenues of India or imposing any charge on the revenues of India (c) ; or

(b) The religion or religious rites and usages of any class of His Majesty's subjects in India ; or

(c) The discipline or maintenance of any part of His Majesty's military or naval forces ; or

(d) The relations of the Government with foreign princes or States.

(4) Provided that the Governor-General in Council may, with the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council, make rules authorizing at any legislative meeting of the governor-general's council a discussion of the annual financial state-

ment of the Governor-General in Council and the asking of questions, but under such conditions and restrictions as to subject or otherwise as may be in the said rules prescribed and declared. No member at any such meeting of the council shall have power to submit or propose any resolution or to divide the council in respect of any such financial discussion or the answer to any question asked under the authority of this section or the rules made under this sub-section. Rules made under this sub-section shall not be subject to alteration or amendment at legislative meetings of the council (d).

(a) As to the object with which this section was framed, see par. 24 of Sir C. Wood's dispatch of August 9, 1861.

(b) The words 'or proposed to be introduced' and 'or having reference to some rule for the conduct of business' are not in the Act of 1861, but represent the existing practice.

(c) The words 'or imposing any charge on the revenues of India' might perhaps be omitted as unnecessary.

(d) This proviso reproduces the alterations made by the Act of 1892. Under the existing rules the financial statement must be explained in council every year, and a printed copy must be given to every member. Any member may offer observations on the explanatory statement, the finance member has the right of reply, and the discussion is closed by any observations the president may think fit to make.

65.—(1) When an Act has been passed by the governor-general's council at a legislative meeting, the governor-general, whether he was or was not present in council at the passing thereof, may declare that he assents to the Act, or that he withholds assent from the Act, or that he reserves the Act for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure thereon.

Assent of
governor-
general to
Acts.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 20.]

(2) An Act of the Governor-General in Council has not validity until the governor-general has declared his assent thereto, or, in the case of an Act reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure, until His Majesty has signified his assent to the governor-general through the Secretary of State in Council, and that assent has been notified in the Gazette of India.

Power of
Crown to
disallow
Acts.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 21.]

66.—(1) When an Act of the Governor-General in Council has been assented to by the governor-general he must send to the Secretary of State an authentic copy thereof.

(2) It is lawful for His Majesty to signify through the Secretary of State in Council his disallowance of any such Act.

(3) Where the disallowance of any such Act has been so signified, the governor-general must forthwith notify the disallowance, and thereupon the Act, as from the date of the notification, becomes void accordingly (*a*).

(*a*) When an Act has been passed by the Governor-General in Council the Secretary of State usually sends a dispatch intimating that the Act has been considered in council and will be left to its operation. But this formal expression of approval is not essential to the validity of the Act.

Rules for
conduct of
business.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 18.]

67. The Governor-General in Council may at legislative meetings of the governor-general's council, subject to the assent of the governor-general, make rules for the conduct of business at legislative meetings of the council, and for prescribing the mode of promulgation and authentication of Acts made at such meetings; but any such rule may be disallowed by the Secretary of State in Council, and if so disallowed has no effect.

A bill, when introduced, is published in the official gazettes in English and the local vernacular, with a 'Statement of Objects and Reasons,' and a similar course is usually adopted after every subsequent stage of the bill at which important amendments have been made. Thus a bill as amended in committee is published with the report of the committee explaining the nature of, and reasons for the amendment. The draft of a bill is in some cases published for the purpose of eliciting opinion, before its introduction into the council.

When a bill is introduced, or on some subsequent occasion, the member in charge of it makes one or more of the following motions—

(1) That it be referred to a select committee; or

(2) That it be taken into consideration by the council, either at once or on some future day to be then mentioned; or

(3) That it be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.

The usual course is to refer a bill after introduction to a select committee. It is then considered in council after it is reported by the committee, with or without amendments, and is passed, either with or without further amendments made by the council.

TABLE OF CASES

- Advocate-General of Bengal *v.* Rancee Surnomoye Dossec, 251.
 Alter Caufman *v.* Government of Bombay, 88.
 Ameer Khan, *In the matter of*, 54, 59, 207, 248, 262.
 Attorney-General for the Colony of Hong Kong *v.* Kwok-a-Sing, 346.
 Audur Chundra Shaw, *Re*, 245.

 Bedreecbund *v.* Elphinstone, 172.
 Bell *v.* Municipality of Madras, 177, 221.
 Bichitramund, *Re*, 265.
 Bradley *v.* Arthur, 268, 270.

 Collector of Masulipatam *v.* Cavalry Vencata Narrainapah, 160.
 Collector of Sea Customs *v.* Panniar Chithambaram, 245.
 Collector of Thana *v.* Bhaskar Mahadev Rheth, 220.
 Cook *v.* Sprigg, 174.

 Damodhar Gordhan *v.* Deoram Kanji (the Bhaunagar case), 39, 177, 207.
 Doss *v.* The Secretary of State for India in Council, 171, 174.
 Dunn *v.* The Queen, 158.
 — *v.* McDonald, *ib.*

 East India Company *v.* Sandys, 25.
 — *v.* Syed Ally, 172.
 Empress *v.* Keshub Mahajun, 265.
 — *v.* S. Moorga Chetty, 352, 386.
 — *v.* Surmook Singh, 386.

 Forester and others *v.* Secretary of State for India in Council, 173.
 Freeman *v.* Fairlie, 251.
 Frith *v.* Regina, 171.

 Ganpat Pataya *v.* Collector of Canara, 175, 177.
 Gibson *v.* East India Company, 169, 172.

 Grant *v.* The Secretary of State for India in Council, 157, 174.
 Gregory *v.* Vudakasi Kaujani, 386.

 Harris *v.* Davies, 204.
 Hayes, *Re*, 386, 394.
 Hemchand Devchand *v.* Azam Sakarlal Chhotamlal, 177, 265, 396.
 Hill *v.* Bigge, 175.

 Indian Chief, *The*, 251, 355.

 Jagat Mohini Dasi *v.* Dwarkanath Boisakh, 250.
 Jehangir *v.* Secretary of State for India, 158, 171, 248.

 Kinlock *v.* Secretary of State in Council, 170, 174.

 Lachmi Narayan *v.* Raja Pratab Singh, 36, 145, 177, 207.
Laconia, *The* 355, 371.

 Madhub Chunder Poranamah *v.* Rajoomar Doss, 251.
 Mandalay *v.* The East India Company, 172.
 Marais, D. F., *Ex pte.*, 172.
 Mayor of Lyons *v.* East India Company, 51, 251, 324.
 Muhammed Yusuf-Ud-Din *v.* The Queen-Empress, 394.
 Musgrove *v.* Chun Teecong Toy, 88, 204.
 Musgrove *v.* Pulido, 175.

 Nabob of the Carnatic *v.* East India Company, 172.
 Nga Hoong *v.* Reg., 242.
 Nireaha Tamaki *v.* Baker, 175.
 Nobin Chunder Bannerjee *v.* Romesh Chunder Ghose, 250.
 Nobin Chunder Dey *v.* The Secretary of State for India, 171.

 Papayanni *v.* The Russian Steam Navigation Company, 355.

68.—(1) (a) The local Government (b) of any part of British India to which this section for the time being applies may propose to the Governor-General in Council the draft of any regulation for the peace and government of that part, with the reasons for proposing the regulation.

(2) Thereupon the Governor-General in Council may take any such draft and reasons into consideration, and when any such draft has been approved by the Governor-General in Council and assented to by the governor-general (c), it must be published in the Gazette of India, and in the local official gazette, if any, and thereupon has the like force of law and is subject to the like disallowance as if it had been made by the Governor-General in Council at a legislative meeting.

(3) The governor-general must send to the Secretary of State an authentic copy of every regulation to which he has assented under this section.

(4) The Secretary of State may by resolution in council apply this section to any part of British India as from a date to be fixed in the resolution, and withdraw the application of this section from any part to which it has been applied (d).

(a) This power was conferred by the Act of 1870, with the object of providing a more summary legislative procedure for the more backward parts of British India. The enactment conferring the power was passed in consequence of a dispatch from the Government of India drafted by Sir H. S. Maine. (See Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, Nos. 67, 69.) The regulations made under it must be distinguished from the old Madras, Bengal, and Bombay regulations, which were made before 1833 by the Governments of the three presidencies, and some of which are still in force.

(b) 'Local Government' is defined by s. 124.

(c) It will be observed that the Governor-General in Council cannot amend the draft.

(d) The Indian Statute Book has from the earliest times contained 'deregulationizing' enactments, i.e. enactments barring, completely or partially, the application in the more backward and less civilized parts of the country of the ordinary law, which was at first contained in the old 'regulations.' These enactments took varied and sometimes very complicated forms, so that, in course of time, doubts arose, and it became occasionally a matter of considerable difficulty to ascertain what laws were and what were not in force in the different 'deregulationizing' parts of the country.

lationized' tracts. The main object of the Scheduled Districts Act, 1874 (XIV of 1874), was to provide a method of removing these doubts by means of notifications to be issued by the Executive Government. The preamble refers to the fact that 'various parts of British India had never been brought within, or had from time to time been removed from, the operation of the general Acts and regulations, and the jurisdiction of the ordinary Courts of Judicature'; that 'doubts had arisen in some cases as to which Acts or regulations were in force in such parts, and in other cases as to what were the boundaries of such parts'; and that 'it was expedient to provide readier means for ascertaining the enactments in force in such territories and the boundaries thereof, and for administering the law therein.' The Act then proceeds to specify and constitute a number of deregulationized tracts as 'scheduled districts,' to give the power of declaring by notification what enactments are, or are not, actually in force in any scheduled district, and to provide for extending by notification to any 'scheduled district,' with or without modifications or restrictions, any enactment in force in any part of British India at the date of the extension. The Act also gives powers to appoint officers for the administration of a scheduled district, and to regulate their procedure and the exercise of their powers therein, and also to settle questions as to the boundaries of any such tract. A large number of declaratory and extending notifications have been issued under the Act.

Every district to which 33 Vict. c. 3, s. 1 (reproduced by this section of the Digest), is made applicable thereupon becomes by virtue of s. 1 of the Indian Scheduled Districts Act, 1874 (XIV of 1874), a scheduled district within the meaning of that Act and of the Indian General Clauses Act, 1897 (X of 1897, s. 3 (49)).

The Scheduled Districts Act, 1874, is immediately followed in the Indian Statute Book by the Laws Local Extent Act, 1874 (XV of 1874), the object of which is to remove doubts as to the application of certain enactments to the whole or particular parts of British India. This Act also uses the expression 'scheduled districts,' but in a sense which has in the course of time become different from that in which the term is used in the Scheduled Districts Act. The lists of scheduled districts appended to the two Acts were originally identical, but since 1874 Acts have been passed which have amended or partially repealed the list in Act XIV, but have not in all cases made corresponding alterations in the list annexed to Act XV. Moreover, certain regions not included in the original schedule have, by reason of the application to them of 33 Vict. c. 3, s. 1, become *ipso facto* scheduled districts. The Legislative Department of the Government of India has published lists of the 'territories which are "deregulationized," "scheduled," and subject to the statute 33 Vict. c. 3, s. 1, respectively.'

Power to
make
ordi-
nances in

69. The governor-general may in cases of emergency make and promulgate ordinances for the peace and good government of British India, or any part thereof, and any

ordinance so made has, for such period not exceeding six months from its promulgation as may be declared in the notification, the like force of law to a law made by the Governor-General in Council at a legislative meeting; but the power of making ordinances under this section is subject to the like restrictions as the power of making laws at legislative meetings; and any ordinance made under this section is subject to the like disallowance as a law passed at a legislative meeting, and may be controlled or superseded by any such law.

The power given by this section has rarely been exercised, and should be called into action only on urgent occasions. The reasons for a resort to it should always be recorded, and these, together with the Ordinance itself, should be submitted without loss of time to His Majesty's Government.

Local Legislatures.

70. The Governor of Madras in Council, the Governor of Bombay in Council, the Lieutenant-Governors in Council of Bengal, the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, the Punjab, Burma, and Eastern Bengal and Assam, and any local legislature which may be hereafter constituted in pursuance of the Indian Councils Act, 1861, are local legislatures within the meaning of this Digest.

This section follows substantially the definition of 'local legislature' in the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 6), with the modifications required by the local legislatures constituted since its passing.

71.—(1) (a) The legislative powers of the Governor of Madras in Council and the Governor of Bombay in Council are exercised at legislative meetings of their respective councils.

(2) For the exercise of those powers the governors of Madras and Bombay respectively must nominate persons resident in India to be additional members of their councils.

(3) The number of the additional members of each of the said councils (besides the advocate-general of the province

cases of
emer-
gency.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 23.]

Meaning
of local
legis-
latures.
[See 55 &
56 Vict. c.
14, s. 6.]
24 & 25
Vict. c. 67.

Constitu-
tion of
legis-
lative
council
in Madras
and
Bombay.
[24 & 25
Vict. c. 67,
ss. 29, 30,
55 & 56
Vict. c. 14,
ss. 1, 4.]

or officer acting in that capacity) is such as to the governors of Madras and Bombay respectively from time to time seems expedient, but must be not less than eight nor more than twenty (b).

(4) The advocate-general or acting advocate-general for the time being of the province must be appointed one of the additional members of the council of the governor of that province.

(5) Of the additional members of each of the said councils at least one-half (c) must be persons who are not in the civil or military service of the Crown in India, and if any such additional member accepts office under the Crown in India, his seat as an additional member thereupon becomes vacant.

(6) The term of office of an additional member of either of the said councils [other than the advocate-general or acting advocate-general] (d) is two years.

(7) An additional member of either of the said councils is entitled to be present at legislative meetings of the council, and at no others.

(8) The Governor-General in Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, make regulations (e) as to the conditions under which nominations are to be made under this section, and prescribe the manner in which such regulations are to be carried into effect.

(a) This section reproduces the provisions of the Act of 1861, as modified by the Act of 1892.

(b) The number under the Act of 1861 was not less than four nor more than eight.

(c) 'One-half.' Does this include the advocate-general? The point does not seem clear.

(d) The words in square brackets probably express the effect of the existing law, but the construction is not clear.

(e) The effect of these regulations is summarized above, pp. 119, 120.

Procedure
at legis-
lative
meetings
of councils
of Madras

72.—(1) At every legislative meeting of the council of the Governor of Madras, or of the Governor of Bombay, the governor or some ordinary member of his council, and at least four other members of the council, must be present.

(2) The governor, if present, and in his absence the senior and Bombay. ordinary member (a) of his council, presides.

(3) In case of difference of opinion at any such legislative meeting, the opinion of the majority prevails. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 34, 36.]

(4) In case of an equality of votes, the governor, or in his absence the member presiding, has a second or casting vote.

(5) Any such legislative meeting must be held at such time and place as the governor appoints, and may be adjourned by the governor or by the person presiding at the meeting if so authorized by the governor.

(a) The expression in the Act of 1861 is 'senior civil ordinary member,' and the word 'civil' was perhaps intended to exclude the local commander-in-chief, who, however, was an extraordinary member. If so, the word has become unnecessary since the passing of the Madras and Bombay Armies Act (56 & 57 Vict. c. 62).

73.—(1) The members of the councils of the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal (a), of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (b), of the Punjab (b), of Burma (b), of Eastern Bengal and Assam, and of any lieutenant-governor for whose province a local legislature is hereafter constituted, must be such persons resident in India as the lieutenant-governor, with the approval of the governor-general, nominates, subject to this qualification, that not less than one-third of the members of each council must be persons who are not in the civil or military service of the Crown in India. Constitution of legislative councils of lieutenant-governors. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 45, 48, 55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 1.]

(2) The number of the members of the councils of the lieutenant-governors of Bengal, the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, of the Punjab, and of Burma respectively is such as the Governor-General in Council may from time to time fix by proclamation, but must not be more than twenty for Bengal and not more than fifteen for the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (c).

(3) The number of the members of any other council of a lieutenant-governor constituted for legislative purposes must be that fixed by the notification under which the council is constituted.

(4) The term of office of a member of a lieutenant-governor in council is two years.

(5) The Governor-General in Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, make regulations as to the conditions under which nominations are to be made under this section, and prescribe the manner in which such regulations are to be carried into effect (*d*).

(a) Section 44 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861, enacted that the Governor-General in Council, so soon as it should appear to him expedient, should, by proclamation, extend the provisions of the Act touching the making of laws and regulations for the peace and good government of the presidencies of Fort Saint George and Bombay to the Bengal division of the Presidency of Fort William, and should specify in such proclamation the period at which such provisions should have effect, and the number of councillors which the lieutenant-governor of the said division might nominate for his assistance in making laws and regulations. Accordingly a legislative council was established for Bengal by proclamation of January 18, 1862. *Calcutta Gazette*, 1862, pp. 227, 228.

(b) By s. 44 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861, the Governor-General in Council was also empowered to extend the provisions of the Act to the territories known as the North-Western Provinces and the Punjab respectively. A legislative council was established for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh together (see the powers under the next section), by proclamation of November 26, 1886, and the name of the province for which the council was established was in 1901 altered to the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. Legislative councils were established for the Punjab and Burma by proclamation of April 9, 1897, and for the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam by proclamation of September 1, 1905. See Act VII of 1905. The number of councillors to be nominated was fixed at nine for the Punjab and Burma respectively, and fifteen for Eastern Bengal and Assam.

(c) By the Act of 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 1) the Governor-General in Council was empowered to increase by proclamation the number of legislative councillors for Bengal and for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, subject to the maximum limit of twenty and fifteen. The number for Bengal was, by proclamation of March 16, 1893, fixed at twenty. The number for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh (now the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh) was, by proclamation of the same date, fixed at fifteen.

(d) This power was given by the Act of 1892. The regulations are to the same general effect as those for Madras and Bombay. See above, pp. 119, 120.

Power to
constitute

74.—(1) The Governor-General in Council may, with the previous approval of the Secretary of State in Council, and

by notification in the Gazette of India, constitute a new province for legislative purposes, and, if necessary, appoint a lieutenant-governor for any such province, and constitute the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the province, as from a date specified in the notification, a local legislature for that province, and fix the number of the lieutenant-governor in Council, and define the limits of the province for which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is to exercise legislative powers.

new local
legisla-
tures.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, ss. 46-
49.]

(2) Any law made by the local legislature of any province shall continue in force in any part of the province severed therefrom in pursuance of this section until suspended by a law of the governor-general or of the local legislature to whose province the part is annexed (a).

(a) This section is intended to give the effect of the existing enactments in the Act of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 46-49), which run as follows:—

‘46. It shall be lawful for the governor-general, by proclamation as aforesaid, to constitute from time to time new provinces for the purposes of this Act, to which the like provisions shall be applicable; and, further, to appoint from time to time a lieutenant-governor to any province so constituted as aforesaid, and from time to time to declare and limit the extent of the authority of such lieutenant-governor, in like manner as is provided by the Government of India Act, 1854, respecting the lieutenant-governors of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces.

‘47. It shall be lawful for the Governor-General in Council, by such proclamation as aforesaid, to fix the limits of any presidency, division, province, or territory in India for the purposes of this Act, and further by proclamation to divide or alter from time to time the limits of any such presidency, division, province, or territory, for the said purposes. Provided always, that any law or regulation made by the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any presidency, division, province, or territory shall continue in force in any part thereof which may be severed therefrom by any such proclamation, until superseded by law or regulation of the Governor-General in Council, or of the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the presidency, division, province, or territory to which such parts may become annexed.

‘48. It shall be lawful for every such Lieutenant-Governor in Council thus constituted to make laws for the peace and good government of his respective division, province, or territory; and, except as otherwise hereinbefore specially provided, all the provisions in this Act contained

respecting the nomination of additional members for the purpose of making laws and regulations for the presidencies of Fort Saint George and Bombay, and limiting the power of the Governors in Council of Fort Saint George and Bombay, for the purpose of making laws and regulations, and respecting the conduct of business in the meetings of such councils for that purpose, and respecting the power of the governor-general to declare or withhold his assent to laws or regulations made by the Governor in Council of Fort Saint George and Bombay, and respecting the power of Her Majesty to disallow the same, shall apply to laws or regulations to be so made by any such Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

‘49. Provided always, that no proclamation to be made by the Governor-General in Council under the provisions of this Act, for the purpose of constituting any council for any presidency, division, provinces, or territories hereinbefore named, or any other provinces, or for altering the boundaries of any presidency, division, province, or territory, or constituting any new province for the purpose of this Act, shall have any force or validity until the sanction of Her Majesty to the same shall have been previously signified by the Secretary of State in Council to the governor-general.’

It was under these enactments that local legislatures were established for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh (1886), for Burma (1897), and for Eastern Bengal and Assam (1905). *See* Act VII of 1905.

The effect of the enactments appears to be that a new lieutenant-governorship cannot be created unless a local legislature is created at the same time, as was done in the last two cases mentioned above.

Procedure
at meet-
ings of
Lieuten-
ant-governor's
council.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 45.]

75.—(1) At every meeting of a lieutenant-governor's council the lieutenant-governor, or in his absence the member of the council highest in official rank among those holding office under the Crown, presides.

(2) The legislative powers of the council may be exercised only at meetings at which the lieutenant-governor or some other member holding office under the Crown, and not less than one-half of the members of the council, are present.

(3) In case of difference of opinion at any meeting of the lieutenant-governor's council, if there is an equality of votes, the lieutenant-governor or other person presiding has a second or casting vote.

Powers of
local
legisla-
ture.
[24 & 25
Vict. c. 67,

76.—(1) The local legislature of any province in India may, subject to the provisions of this Digest, make laws for the peace and good government of the territories for the time being constituting that province (a).

(2) The local legislature of any province may, with the previous sanction of the governor-general, but not otherwise, repeal or amend as to that province any law or regulation made by any authority in India other than that local legislature (b). ss. 42, 43,
48.
55 & 56
Vict. c.
14, s. 5-1

(3) The local legislature of any province may not, without the previous sanction of the governor-general, make or take into consideration any law—

- (a) affecting the public debt of India, or the customs duties or any other tax or duty for the time being in force and imposed by the authority of the Governor-General in Council for the general purposes of the government of India ; or
- (b) regulating any of the current coin, or the issue of any bills, notes, or other paper currency ; or
- (c) regulating the conveyance of letters by the post office or messages by the electric telegraph within the province ; or
- (d) altering in any way the Indian Penal Code (c) ; or
- (e) affecting the religion or religious rites or usages of any class of His Majesty's subjects in India ; or
- (f) affecting the discipline or maintenance of any part of His Majesty's naval or military forces ; or
- (g) regulating patents or copyright ; or
- (h) affecting the relations of the Government with foreign princes or States.

(4) The local legislature of any province has not power to make any law affecting any Act of Parliament for the time being in force in the province (d).

(5) Provided that an Act or a provision of an Act made by a local legislature, and subsequently assented to by the governor-general in pursuance of the provisions contained in this Digest, is not to be deemed invalid by reason only of its requiring the previous sanction of the governor-general under this section.

(a) The Governor-General in Council has concurrent power to legislate for a province under a local legislature. In practice, however, this power is not, unless under very exceptional circumstances, exercised as to matters within the competency of the local legislature

(b) Under the Act of 1861 a local legislature could not alter an Act of the Government of India passed after the Act of 1861 came into operation. Consequently the sphere of operations of the local legislatures was often inconveniently restricted by the numerous Acts passed by the Governor-General in Council since 1861, particularly by such general Acts as the Evidence Act and the Easements Act. The provision reproduced in sub-section (2) was inserted in the Act of 1892 for the purpose of removing this inconvenience.

(c) Sir Charles Wood, when Secretary of State for India, in a dispatch dated December 1, 1862, addressed the Government of India as follows :—

‘Cases, no doubt, will occasionally occur when special legislation by the local Governments for offences not included in the Penal Code will be required. In these cases the general rule should be to place such offences under penalties already assigned in the Code to acts of a similar character. This mode of legislation, though an addition to, cannot be deemed an alteration of the Penal Code ; but if any deviation is considered necessary, then the law requires that your previous sanction should be obtained.

‘It was the intention of Her Majesty’s Government that, except in local and peculiar circumstances, the Code should contain the whole body of penal legislation, and that all additions or modifications suggested by experience should from time to time be incorporated in it. And the duty of maintaining this uniformity, of course, devolves upon your Excellency in Council.

‘As a general rule, for the guidance of the local councils, it would probably be expedient—and this appears also to be your own view—that all bills containing penal clauses should be submitted for your previous sanction.’

In consequence of this dispatch all Bills introduced into a local legislature and containing penal clauses are required to be sent to the Government of India for consideration as to the penal clauses.

As to what would amount to an alteration of the Penal Code, see Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, Nos. 5 and 6.

(d) Among the Acts which a local legislature cannot ‘affect’ is the Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), and, consequently, questions have arisen as to the validity of laws affecting the jurisdiction of the chartered high court. It has been held that the Governor of Bombay in Council has power to pass Acts limiting or regulating the jurisdiction of the courts established by the local legislature, and that such Acts are not void merely because their indirect effect may be to increase or diminish the occasions for the exercise of the appellate jurisdiction of the high court (*Premshankar Raghunathji v. Government of Bombay*, 8 Bom. H. C. Rep. A. C. I. 195). Also that the Bombay Legislative Council has authority to make laws regulating the rights and obligations of the subjects of the Bombay Government, but not to affect the authority of the high court in dealing with those rights and obligations (*Collector of Thana v. Bhaskar Mahadev Rheth*, I. L. R., 8 Bom. 264).

- Peninsular and Oriental Company *v.*
 Secretary of State for India in
 Council, 171.
 Powell *v.* Apollo Candle Company,
 204.
 Premshankar Raghunathji *v.* Go-
 vernment of Bombay, 220.
 Prioleau *v.* United States, 172.

 Queen, The, *v.* Abdul Latib, 386.
 — *v.* Burah, 203, 386.
 — *v.* The Commissioners of the
 Treasury, 175.
 Queen-Empress, The, *v.* Barton, 242,
 245.
 — *v.* Daya Bhima, 386.
 — *v.* Edwards, *ib.*
 — *v.* Ganpatras Ram Chandra, *ib.*
 — *v.* Kirpal Singh, *ib.*
 — *v.* Mangal Takchand, *ib.*
 — *v.* Natwarai, *ib.*

 Raja of Coorg *v.* East India Com-
 pany, 172, 173.
 Raja Salig Ram *v.* Secretary of State
 for India in Council, 173.
 Raleigh *v.* Goschen, 171.
 Ram Coomar Coondoo *v.* Chunder
 Canta Mookerjee, 251.
 Rance Sonet Kowar *v.* Mirza Humut
 Bahadoor, 160.
 Rao Balwant Singh *v.* Rani Ki-
 shori, 239.
 Reiner *v.* Marquis of Salisbury, 171.
 R. *v.* Anderson, 345.
 — *v.* Bernard, 351.
 — *v.* Carr, 345.
 — *v.* Debruiel, 352.
 — *v.* Edmondstone, 265.
 — *v.* Jameson, 342, 344.

 R. *v.* Kastya Rama, 205.
 — *v.* Keyn, 244.
 — *v.* Lords Commissioners of the
 Treasury, 171.
 — *v.* Lakhya Govind, 386.
 — *v.* Meares, 207.
 — *v.* Pirtal, 386.
 — *v.* Reay, 106, 223.
 — *v.* Thomas, 170.

 Salaman *v.* Secretary of State for
 India in Council, 175.
 Sarkies *v.* Prosonno Mayi Dasi, 250.
 Secretary of State for India *v.* Bom-
 bay Landing and Shipping Com-
 pany, 170, 177, 251.
 — *v.* Matthurabhai, 177.
 Secretary of State in Council of
 India *v.* Kamachee Boye Sahaba,
 172.
 Shenton *v.* Smith, 157.
 Shivabhajan *v.* Secretary of State
 for India, 160, 171.
 Siddha *v.* Biligiri, 386.
 Sirdar Bhagwan Singh *v.* Secretary
 of State for India in Council, 173.
 Sprigg *v.* Siggan, 204.

 Taluka of Kotda Sangani *v.* The
 State of Gondal, 177, 205, 396.

 Voss *v.* Secretary of State for India,
 158.

 Walker *v.* Baird, 174, 202.
 Wallace, *Re*, 240.
 West Rand Central Gold Mining
 Company Limited *v.* The King,
 174.
 Willis *v.* Gipps, 159.

The power of the Governor-General in Council to affect by legislation the prerogative of the Crown is expressly recognized by statute (see below, s. 79). It may perhaps be inferred that the local legislatures do not possess this power. But see *Bell v. Municipality of Madras*, 25 Mad. 474.

77.—(1) At a legislative meeting of the Governor of Business
Madras in Council or of the Governor of Bombay in Council, at legis-
and at a meeting of a Lieutenant-Governor in Council, no lative
business may be transacted other than the consideration of meetings.
measures introduced [or proposed to be introduced] (a) into [24 & 25
the council for the purpose of enactment, or the alteration 55 & 56
of rules for the conduct of business at legislative meetings. Vict. c. 14, s. 2.]

(2) At any such meeting no motion may be entertained other than a motion for leave to introduce a measure into the council for the purpose of enactment, or having reference to a measure introduced [or proposed to be introduced into the council for that purpose, or having reference to some rule for the conduct of business] (a).

(3) Provided that the Governors in Council of Madras and Bombay respectively, and the lieutenant-governor of any province having a local legislature, may, with the sanction of the Governor-General in Council, make rules for authorizing at any legislative meeting of their respective councils the discussion of the annual financial statement of their respective local Governments and the asking of questions, but under such conditions and restrictions as to subject or otherwise as may in the rules applicable to those councils respectively be prescribed or declared. But no member at any legislative meeting of any such council has power to submit or propose any resolution or to divide the council in respect of any such financial discussion or the answer to any question asked under the authority of this sub-section or the rules made under this sub-section (b).

(4) It is not lawful for any member of any such council to introduce, without the previous sanction of the governor or lieutenant-governor, any measure affecting the public revenues of the province or imposing any charge on those revenues.

(5) Rules for the conduct of business at legislative meetings of the Governor of Madras in Council, or of the Governor of Bombay in Council, or of any Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may be made and amended at legislative meetings of the council, subject to the assent of that governor or lieutenant-governor, but any such rule may be disallowed by the Governor-General in Council, and if so disallowed shall have no effect: Provided that rules made under this section with respect to the discussion of the annual financial statement and the asking of questions are not to be subject to amendment as aforesaid.

(a) The words in square brackets are not in the Act of 1861, but represent the existing practice.

(b) This qualification on the restrictions imposed by the Act of 1861 was introduced by the Act of 1892.

Assent to
Acts of
local legis-
latures.

78.—(1) When an Act has been passed by the council of a governor at a legislative meeting thereof, or by the council of a lieutenant-governor, the governor or lieutenant-governor, whether he was or was not present in council at the passing of the Act, may declare that he assents to or withholds his assent from the Act.

(2) If the governor or lieutenant-governor withholds his assent from any such Act, the Act has no effect.

(3) If the governor or lieutenant-governor assents to any such Act he must forthwith send an authentic copy of the Act to the governor-general, and the Act has not validity until the governor-general has assented thereto, and that assent has been signified by the governor-general to the governor or lieutenant-governor, and published by the governor or lieutenant-governor.

(4) Where the governor-general withholds his assent from any such Act he must signify to the governor or lieutenant-governor in writing his reason for so withholding his assent (a).

(5) When any such Act has been assented to by the governor-general, he must send to the Secretary of State an authentic copy thereof, and it is lawful for His Majesty to signify through the Secretary of State in Council his disallowance of any such Act.

(6) Where the disallowance of any such Act has been so signified the governor or lieutenant-governor must forthwith notify the disallowance, and thereupon the Act, as from the date of the notification, becomes void accordingly.

(a) Assent has been withheld on one or more of the following grounds :—

(1) that the principle or policy of the Act, or of some particular provision of the Act, is unsound ;

(2) that the Act, or some provision of the Act, is *ultra vires* of the local legislature ;

(3) that the Act is defective in form.

With respect to (3) the recent practice of the Government of India has, it is believed, been to avoid as much as possible criticism of the drafting of local Bills or Acts.

Validity of Indian Laws.

79. A law made by any authority in India is not invalid solely on account of any one or more of the following reasons :—

(a) in the case of a law made by the Governor-General in Council, because it affects the prerogative of the Crown (a) :

(b) in the case of any law, because the requisite proportion of members not holding office under the Crown in India was not complete at the date of its introduction to the Council or its enactment :

(c) in the case of a law made by a local legislature, because it confers on magistrates, being justices of the peace, the same jurisdiction over European British subjects as that legislature by Acts duly made could lawfully confer on magistrates in the exercise of authority over natives in the like cases (b).

(a) This saving does not appear to apply to the local legislatures. See note (c) on s. 76. As to the prerogatives of the Crown, see note (a) on s. 36.

(b) An Indian Act (XXII of 1870) was passed to confirm certain previous Acts of the Madras and Bombay legislatures which had been adjudged invalid on the ground of interference with the rights of European British subjects. See *R. v. Reay*, 7 Bom. Cr. 6, and the speeches of Mr. FitzJames Stephen in the Legislative Council in 1870, Proceedings, pp. 362, 384. As Indian legislation could not confer on local legislatures the requisite power in the future, it was conferred by an Act of Parliament in 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 34).

Removal
of doubts
as to
validity of
certain
laws.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, ss. 14,
24, 33, 48.
34 & 35
Vict. c.
34, s. 1.]

PART VII.

SALARIES, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, VACATION OF OFFICE,
TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Salaries
and allow-
ances of
governor-
general
and cer-
tain other
officials in
India.

[33 Geo.

III, c.

52, s. 32.

3 & 4

Will. IV,

c. 85, ss.

76, 77.

16 & 17

Vict. c.

95, s. 35.

24 & 25

Vict. c.

67, s. 4.

43 Vict. c.

3, ss. 2, 4.]

80.—(1) There are to be paid to the Governor-General of India and to the other persons mentioned in the First Schedule to this Digest, out of the revenues of India, such salaries, not exceeding in any case the maximum specified in that behalf in the said schedule, and such allowances (if any) for equipment and voyage, as the Secretary of State in Council may by order fix in that behalf, and subject to or in default of any such order, as are now payable.

(2) Provided as follows :

(a) An order affecting salaries of members of the Governor-General's council may not be made without the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India ;

(b) If any person to whom this section applies holds or enjoys any pension or salary, or any office of profit under the Crown or under any public office, his salary under this section must be reduced by the amount of the pension, salary, or profits of office so held or enjoyed by him ;

(c) Nothing in the provisions of this section with respect to allowances authorizes the imposition of any additional charge on the revenues of India.

(3) The salary payable to a person under this section commences on his taking upon himself the execution of the office to which the salary is attached, and is to be the whole profit or advantage which he enjoys during his continuance in the office (α).

(α) The salaries of the governor-general, governors, and members of council were fixed at what is shown as the maximum in the First Schedule by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76 ; but were there declared to be subject to such reduction as the Court of Directors, with the sanction of the Board of Control, might at any time think fit.

The salary of the commander-in-chief and of lieutenant-governors was fixed at 100,000 Company's rupees by 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 35, but the salaries so fixed were declared to be subject to the provisions and regulations of the Government of India Act, 1833 (3 Will. IV. c. 85), concerning the salaries thereby appointed.

The view adopted in this Digest is that these salaries can be fixed at any amount not exceeding the amounts specified in the Acts of 1833 and 1853. The power to reduce has been exercised more than once, but it is open to argument whether the power to reduce involves a power to raise subsequently.

The allowances for equipment and voyage of the officers mentioned in the First Schedule (and also of the bishops and archdeacons of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay) may, under the Indian Salaries and Allowances Act, 1880 (43 Vict. c. 3), be fixed, altered or abolished by the Secretary of State in Council. But nothing in that Act was to authorize the imposition of any additional charge on the revenues of India.

Sub-section (3) is taken from s. 76 of the Act of 1833.

Under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 32, a commander-in-chief was not to be entitled to any salary or emolument as member of council, unless it was specially granted by the Court of Directors.

The salaries and allowances now paid under the enactments reproduced in this Digest are as follows :—

<i>Officer.</i>	<i>Salary.</i>	<i>Equipment and Voyage¹.</i>
	Rs.	£
Viceroy and Governor-General	2,50,800	3,500
Governors of Bombay and Madras	1,20,000	1,000
Commander-in-Chief	1,00,000	500
Lieutenant-Governor	1,00,000	—
Member of Governor-General's Council	76,800	300
Member of Council, Madras and Bombay	61,440	—
Chief Justice, Calcutta	72,000	300
Puisne Judges, Calcutta	45,000	
Chief Justice, Madras	60,000	
Puisne Judges, Madras	45,000	
Chief Justice, Bombay	60,000	300
Puisne Judges, Bombay	45,000	
Bishop of Calcutta	45,977	
Bishops of Madras and Bombay	25,600	
Archdeacon, Calcutta	Pay as Senior Chaplains Rs. 3,200	
„ Madras		
„ Bombay		

¹ These allowances are not payable unless the officer is resident in Europe at the time of the appointment.

The salary of the commander-in-chief and of lieutenant-governors was fixed at 100,000 Company's rupees by 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 35, but the salaries so fixed were declared to be subject to the provisions and regulations of the Government of India Act, 1833 (3 Will. IV, c. 85), concerning the salaries thereby appointed.

The view adopted in this Digest is that these salaries can be fixed at any amount not exceeding the amounts specified in the Acts of 1833 and 1853. The power to reduce has been exercised more than once, but it is open to argument whether the power to reduce involves a power to raise subsequently.

The allowances for equipment and voyage of the officers mentioned in the First Schedule (and also of the bishops and archdeacons of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay) may, under the Indian Salaries and Allowances Act, 1880 (43 Vict. c. 3), be fixed, altered or abolished by the Secretary of State in Council. But nothing in that Act was to authorize the imposition of any additional charge on the revenues of India.

Sub-section (3) is taken from s. 76 of the Act of 1833.

Under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 32, a commander-in-chief was not to be entitled to any salary or emolument as member of council, unless it was specially granted by the Court of Directors.

The salaries and allowances now paid under the enactments reproduced in this Digest are as follows :—

<i>Officer.</i>	<i>Salary.</i>	<i>Equipment and Voyage¹.</i>
	Rs.	£
Viceroy and Governor-General	2,50,800	3,500
Governors of Bombay and Madras	1,20,000	1,000
Commander-in-Chief	1,00,000	500
Lieutenant-Governor	1,00,000	—
Member of Governor-General's Council	70,800	300
Member of Council, Madras and Bombay	61,440	—
Chief Justice, Calcutta	72,000	300
Puisne Judges, Calcutta	45,000	
Chief Justice, Madras	60,000	
Puisne Judges, Madras	45,000	
Chief Justice, Bombay	60,000	
Puisne Judges, Bombay	45,000	300
Bishop of Calcutta	45,977	
Bishops of Madras and Bombay	25,600	
Archdeacon, Calcutta	Pay as Senior Chaplains Rs. 3,200	
.. Madras		
.. Bombay		

¹ These allowances are not payable unless the officer is resident in Europe at the time of the appointment.

Leave of
absence to
members
of council.
[24 & 25,
Vict. c.
67, s. 26.]

81.—(1) The Governor-General in Council and the Governors of Madras and Bombay in Council respectively may grant to any of the ordinary members of their respective councils leave of absence under medical certificate for a period not exceeding six months.

(2) Where an ordinary member of council obtains leave of absence in pursuance of this section, he retains his office during his absence, and on his return and resumption of his duties is entitled to receive half his salary for the period of his absence; but if his absence exceeds six months his office becomes vacant.

Provision
as to
absence
from India
or pro-
vince.
[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
s. 37-
7 Geo. IV,
c. 56, s. 31.
3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s. 79.
7 Will. IV,
and 1 Vict.
c. 47.]

82.—(1) If the governor-general, the Governor of Madras, the Governor of Bombay, or the commander-in-chief of His Majesty's forces in India, and, subject to the foregoing provisions of this Digest as to leave of absence, if any ordinary member of the council of the governor-general, or of the Governor of Madras or Bombay, departs from India intending to return to Europe, his office thereupon becomes vacant (*a*).

[(2) No act or declaration of any governor-general, governor, or member of council, other than as aforesaid, except a declaration in writing under hand and seal, delivered to the secretary for the public department of the presidency wherein he is, in order to its being recorded, shall be deemed or held as a resignation or surrender of his office (*b*).]

[(3) If the governor-general, or any ordinary member of the governor-general's council, leaves India otherwise than in the known actual service of the Crown, and if any governor, lieutenant-governor, or ordinary member of a governor's council leaves the presidency to which he belongs otherwise than as aforesaid, his salary and allowances are not payable during his absence to any person for his use (*c*).]

[(4) If any such officer, not having proceeded or intended to proceed to Europe, dies during his absence and whilst intending to return to India or to his presidency, his salary and

allowances, will, subject to any rules in that behalf made by the Secretary of State in Council, be paid to his personal representatives.

(5) If any such officer does not return to India or his presidency, or returns to Europe, his salary and allowances will be deemed to have ceased on the day of his leaving India or his presidency (*d*).]

(a) Under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 37, 'the departure from India of any governor-general, governor, member of council, or commander-in-chief, with intent to return to Europe, shall be deemed in law a resignation and avoidance of his office,' and his arrival in any part of Europe is to be a sufficient indication of such intent. The Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 79) enacts in almost identical words that the return to Europe, or departure from India with intent to return to Europe, of any Governor-General of India, governor, member of council, or commander-in-chief, is to be deemed in law a resignation and avoidance of his office or employment. These provisions have been qualified as to members of council by the power to grant sick leave under the Act of 1861 (see s. 82). But when the Duke of Connaught wished to visit England in the Jubilee year during his term of office as commander-in-chief in the Bombay Presidency a special Act had to be passed (50 Vict. sess. 2, c. 10).

(b) This sub-section reproduces a provision in s. 79 of the Act of 1833, which was copied from a similar provision in the Act of 1793. The provision possibly arose out of the circumstances attending Warren Hastings' resignation in 1776 (see above, p. 61), but does not appear to be observed in practice.

(c) This sub-section is intended to reproduce as far as practicable the effect of the enactments still in force on this subject, but their language is not clear, and was framed with reference to circumstances which no longer exist.

Section 37 of the Act of 1793 enacts that 'if any such governor-general or any other officer whatever in the service of the said Company shall quit or leave the presidency or settlement to which he shall belong, other than in the known actual service of the said Company, the salary and allowances appertaining to his office shall not be paid or payable during his absence to any agent or other person for his use, and in the event of his not returning back to his station at such presidency or settlement, or of his coming to Europe, his salary and allowances shall be deemed to have ceased from the day of his quitting such presidency or settlement, any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.'

An Act of 1826 (7 Geo. IV, c. 56, s. 3), after referring to this provision, enacts that the 'Company may cause payment to be made to the representatives of officers in their service, civil or military, who, having

quitted or left their stations and not having proceeded or intended to proceed to Europe, intending to return to their stations, have died or may hereafter happen to die during their temporary absence within the limits of the said Company's charter or at the Cape of Good Hope, of such salaries and allowances, or of such portions of salaries and allowances, as the officers so dying would have been entitled to if they had returned to their station.'

Section 79 of the Act of 1833 enacts that 'if any such governor-general or member of council of India shall leave the said territories, or if any governor or other officer whatever in the service of the said Company shall leave the presidency to which he shall belong, other than in the known actual service of the said Company, the salary and allowances appertaining to his office shall not be paid or payable during his absence to any agent or other person for his use, and in the event of his not returning or of his coming to Europe, his salary and allowances shall be deemed to have ceased from the day of his leaving the said territories or the presidency to which he may have belonged. Provided that it shall be lawful for the said Company to make such payment as is now by law permitted to be made to the representatives of their officers or servants who, having left their stations intending to return thereto, shall die during their absence.'

An Act of 1837 (7 Will. IV, c. 47) enacts that these provisions in the Acts of 1793 and 1833 are 'not to extend to the case of any officer or servant of the Company under the rank of governor or member of council who shall quit the presidency to which he shall belong in consequence of sickness under such rules as may from time to time be established by the Governor-General of India in Council, or by the Governor in Council of such presidency, as the case may be, and who shall proceed to any place within the limits of the East India Company's charter, or to the Mauritius, or to the island of St. Helena, nor to the case of any officer or servant of the said Company under such rank as aforesaid who, with the permission of the Government of the presidency to which he shall belong, shall quit such presidency in order to proceed to another presidency for the purpose of embarking thence for Europe, until the departure of such officer or servant from such last-mentioned presidency with a view to return to Europe, so as that the port of such departure for Europe shall not be more distant from the place which he shall have quitted in his own presidency than any port of embarkation within such presidency.'

These rules were to require the approval of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control.

Finally, s. 32 of the Act of 1853 (see s. 89 of the Digest) declared that 'Nothing in any enactment now in force, or any charter relating to the said Company, shall be taken to prevent the establishment, by the Court of Directors (under the direction and control of the said Board of Commissioners), from time to time, of any regulations which they may deem expedient in relation to the absence on sick leave or furlough of all or any officers and persons in the service of the said Company in

India, or receiving salaries from the said Company there, under which they respectively may be authorized to repair to and reside in Europe or elsewhere out of the limits of the said Company's charter, without forfeiture of pay or salary, during the times and under the circumstances during and under which they may now be permitted (while absent from their duty) to reside in places out of India within the limits of the said Company's charter, or during such times and under such circumstances as by such regulations may be permitted.'

The powers conferred by the Act of 1853 would seem to over-ride the previous provisions as to salary, but not the previous provisions as to vacation of office.

(d) The last two sub-sections are inserted as a rough reproduction of the Act of 1826, and of an enactment in the Act of 1853, but it is doubtful whether these enactments are still law, and whether they are not superseded by regulations under the Act of 1853.

83.—(1) His Majesty may by warrant under his Sign Manual appoint any person conditionally to succeed to any of the offices of governor-general, governor, or ordinary member of the council of the governor-general or of the Governor of Madras or Governor of Bombay, in the event of the office becoming vacant, or in any other event or contingency expressed in the appointment, and to revoke any such conditional appointment (a).

Condi-
tional
appoint-
ments.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s. 61.
24 & 25
Vict. c. 67,
ss. 2, 5.]

(2) A person so conditionally appointed is not entitled to any authority, salary, or emolument appertaining to the office to which he is appointed, until he is in the actual possession of the office.

(a) By 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, the power of making conditional appointments to the offices of governor-general, governor, and member of the Council of Madras and Bombay was vested in the Court of Directors, and consequently is now vested in the Secretary of State (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 3).

Under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 5, the power of making conditional appointments to the office of ordinary member of the governor-general's council is apparently exercisable either by the King, or by the Secretary of State with the concurrence of a majority of the Council of India.

In practice, the power is in all these cases exercised by the King only.

84.—(1) If any person entitled under a conditional appointment to succeed to the office of governor-general on the occurrence of a vacancy therein, or appointed absolutely to that office, is in India on or after the occurrence of the vacancy, or on or after the receipt of the absolute appoint-

Power for
governor-
general to
exercise
powers
before
taking

A DIGEST OF THE LAW RELATING TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

BRITISH authority in India may be traced, historically, to a twofold source. It is derived partly from the British Crown and Parliament, partly from the Great Mogul and other native rulers of India. Twofold origin of British authority in India.

In England, the powers and privileges granted by royal charter to the East India Company were confirmed, supplemented, regulated, and curtailed by successive Acts of Parliament, and were finally transferred to the Crown.

In India, concessions granted by, or wrested from, native rulers gradually established the Company and the Crown as territorial sovereigns, in rivalry with other country powers; and finally left the British Crown exercising undivided sovereignty throughout British India, and paramount authority over the subordinate native States.

It is with the development of this power in England that we are at present concerned. The history of that development may be roughly divided into three periods.

During the first, or trading, period, which begins with the charter of Elizabeth in 1600, the East India Company are primarily traders. They enjoy important mercantile privileges, and for the purposes of their trade hold sundry factories, mostly on or near the coast, but they have not yet assumed the responsibilities of territorial sovereignty. The cession of Burdwan, Midnapore, and Chittagong in 1760 makes them masters of a large tract of territory, but the first period may, Three periods in history of constitutional development.

seat.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 63.]

ment, as the case may be, and thinks it necessary to exercise the powers of governor-general before he takes his seat in council, he may make known by proclamation his appointment, and his intention to assume the office of governor-general.

(2) After the proclamation, and thenceforth until he repairs to the place where the council may assemble, he may exercise alone all or any of the powers which might be exercised by the Governor-General in Council, except the power of making laws at legislative meetings.

(3) All acts done in the council after the date of the proclamation, but before the communication thereof to the council, are valid, subject, nevertheless, to revocation or alteration by the person who has so assumed the office of governor-general.

(4) When the office of governor-general is assumed under the foregoing provision, if there is, at any time before the governor-general takes his seat in council no president of the Council authorized to preside at legislative meetings, the senior ordinary member of council then present presides therein, with the same powers as if a president had been appointed and were absent.

Provision
for temporary
vacancy in
office of
governor-
general.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s. 62.
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, ss. 50,
51.]

85.—(1) If a vacancy occurs in the office of governor-general when there is no conditional or other successor in India to supply the vacancy, the Governor of Madras, or the Governor of Bombay, whichever has been first appointed to the office of governor by His Majesty, is to hold and execute the office of governor-general until a successor arrives or until some person in India is duly appointed thereto.

(2) Every such acting governor-general, while acting as such, has and may exercise all the rights and powers of the office of governor-general, and is entitled to receive the emoluments and advantages appertaining to the office, forgoing the salary and allowances appertaining to his office of governor; and his office of governor is supplied for the

time during which he acts as governor-general in the manner directed by law with respect to vacancies in the office of governor.

(3) If, on the vacancy occurring, it appears to the governor who by virtue of this provision holds and executes the office of governor-general necessary to exercise the powers thereof before he takes his seat in council, he may make known by proclamation his appointment, and his intention to assume the office of governor-general, and thereupon the provisions of this Digest respecting the assumption of the office by a person conditionally appointed to succeed thereto apply.

(4) Until such a governor has assumed the office of governor-general, if no conditional or other successor is on the spot to supply such vacancy, the senior ordinary member of council holds the office of governor-general until the vacancy is filled in accordance with the provisions of this Digest (a).

(5) Every ordinary member of council so acting as governor-general, while so acting, has and may exercise all the rights and powers of the office of governor-general, and is entitled to receive the emoluments and advantages appertaining to the office, forgoing his salary and allowances as member of council for that period.

(a) Thus, on Lord Mayo's death in 1872, Sir John Strachey acted as governor-general from February 9 until the arrival of Lord Napier of Merchistoun on February 23.

86.—(1) If a vacancy occurs in the office of Governor of Madras or Bombay when no conditional or other successor is on the spot to supply the vacancy, the senior ordinary member of the governor's council, or, if there is no council, the senior secretary to the local Government (a), holds and executes the office of governor until a successor arrives, or until some other person on the spot is duly appointed thereto.

Provision for temporary vacancy in office of Governor of Madras or Bombay. [3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 63.]

(2) Every such acting governor is, while acting as such, entitled to receive the emoluments and advantages appertaining

to the office of governor, forgoing the salary and allowances appertaining to his office of member of council or secretary.

(a) The Act of 1833 contained a power to abolish these councils.

Provision
for tem-
porary
vacancy in
office of
ordinary
member of
council.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s. 64,
24 & 25
Viet. c.
67, s. 27.]

87.—(1) If a vacancy occurs in the office of an ordinary member of the council of the governor-general, or of the council of the Governor of Madras or Bombay, when no person conditionally appointed to succeed thereto is present on the spot, the vacancy is to be supplied by the appointment of the Governor-General in Council or Governor in Council, as the case may be.

(2) Until a successor arrives the person so appointed executes the office to which he has been appointed, and has and exercises all the rights and powers thereof, and is entitled to receive the emoluments and advantages appertaining to the office during his continuance therein, forgoing all salaries and allowances by him held and enjoyed at the time of his being appointed to that office.

(3) If any ordinary member of any of the said councils is, by infirmity or otherwise, rendered incapable of acting or of attending to act as such, or is absent on leave, and if any person has been conditionally appointed as aforesaid, the place of the member so incapable or absent is to be supplied by that person.

(4) If no person conditionally appointed to succeed to the office is on the spot, the Governor-General in Council or Governor in Council, as the case may be, is to appoint some person to be a temporary member of council, and, until the return to duty (a) of the member so incapable or absent, the person conditionally or temporarily appointed executes the office to which he has been appointed, and has and exercises all the rights and powers thereof, and receives half the salary of the member of council whose place he supplies, and also half the salary of any other office he may hold, if he hold any such office, the remaining half of such last-named salary being at the disposal of the Governor-General in Council or Governor in Council, whichever may appoint to the office.

(5) Provided as follows :—

(a) No person may be appointed a temporary member of council who might not have been appointed as herein-before provided to fill the vacancy supplied by the temporary appointment ; and

(b) If the Secretary of State informs the governor-general that it is not the intention of His Majesty to fill a vacancy in the council of the governor-general, no temporary appointment may be made under this section to fill the vacancy, and if any such temporary appointment has been made before the date of the receipt of the information by the governor-general, the tenure of the person temporarily appointed ceases from that date.

(c) The words ' to duty ' are not in the Act, but seem to express the intention.

88.—(1) An additional member of the council of the governor-general or of a governor, or a member of the council of a lieutenant-governor, may resign his office to the governor-general or to the governor or lieutenant-governor, and on the acceptance of the resignation the office becomes vacant.

Vacancies amongst additional members of council. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 12, 31. 55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 4.]

(2) If any such additional member or member is absent from India or unable to attend to the duties of his office for a period of two consecutive months, the governor-general, governor, or lieutenant-governor, as the case may be, may declare by a notification published in the Government Gazette, that the seat in council of that additional member or member has become vacant.

(3) In the event of a vacancy occurring by reason of the absence from India, inability to attend to duty, death, acceptance of office, or resignation duly accepted of any such additional member or member, the governor-general, governor, or lieutenant-governor, as the case may be, may nominate any person as an additional member or member, as the case may be, in his place, and every additional member or member so nominated must be summoned to all meetings of the

legislative council to which he belongs for the term of two years from the date of his nomination : Provided that it is not lawful by any such nomination to diminish the proportion of non-official members required by law (a).

(a) The provisions in the Act of 1861 as to the resignation of additional members were modified and supplemented by the Act of 1892.

Leave on
furlough.
[16 & 17
Vict. c.
95, s. 32.]

89. The Secretary of State in Council may, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, make regulations as to the absence on sick leave or furlough of persons in the service of the Crown in India, and the terms as to continuance or diminution of pay, salary, and allowances on which any such sick leave or furlough may be granted.

Power to
make regu-
lations as
to Indian
appoint-
ments.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s. 78.
21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, ss.
30, 37.]

90. The Secretary of State in Council may, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, make regulations for distributing between the several authorities in India the power of making appointments to and promotions in offices, commands, and employments under the Crown in India

PART VIII.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA.

No dis-
abilities in
respect of
religion,
colour, or
place of
birth.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s. 17.]

91. No native of British India, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein, is, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, or colour, or any of them, disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under His Majesty in India.

This reproduces s. 87 of the Act of 1833, with the substitution of 'British India' for 'the said territories,' and 'His Majesty in India' for 'the said Company.' See the comments on this enactment in pars. 103-109 of the dispatch of December 10, 1834.

Regula-
tions for
admission
to civil

92.—(1) The Secretary of State in Council may, with the advice and assistance of the Civil Service Commissioners, make regulations for the examination of natural-born subjects of

His Majesty desirous of becoming candidates for appointment to the Civil Service of India. service.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 32.]

(2) The regulations prescribe the age and qualifications of the candidates, and the subjects of examination.

(3) Every regulation made in pursuance of this section must be forthwith laid before Parliament.

(4) The candidates certified to be entitled under the regulations must be recommended for appointment according to the order of their proficiency as shown by their examination.

(5) Such persons only as are so certified may be appointed or admitted to the Civil Service of India by the Secretary of State in Council (a).

(a) The civil service referred to in these sections is the service which used to be known as the covenanted civil service, but which, under the rules framed in pursuance of Sir Charles Aitchison's Commission, is designated the Civil Service of India. See above, p. 125.

Where a child of a father or mother who has been naturalized under the Naturalization Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 14), has during infancy become resident with the father or mother in any part of the United Kingdom he is, by virtue of s. 10 (5) of that Act, a naturalized British subject, and is entitled to be treated under the enactment reproduced by this clause as if he were a natural-born British subject. The expression includes a native of British India, but would, apparently, not include a subject of a Native State in India.

93. Subject to the provisions of this Digest, all vacancies happening in any of the offices specified or referred to in the Second Schedule to this Digest, and all such offices which may be created hereafter, must be filled from amongst the members of the Civil Service of India belonging to the presidency wherein the vacancy occurs. Offices reserved to civil servants.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
54, s. 2.
33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
s. 57.]

The provision of the Act of 1793 as to filling vacancies from among members belonging to the same presidency appears to be still in force, but has given rise to practical difficulties, and seems inapplicable to such offices as that of secretary to the Government of India.

94.—(1) The authorities in India by whom appointments are made to offices in the Civil Service of India may appoint any native of India of proved merit and ability to any such office, although he has not been admitted to that service in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Digest. Power to appoint natives of India to reserved offices.
[33 & 34

Vict. c.
3, s. 6.]

(2) Every such appointment must be made subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Governor-General in Council, and sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India.

(3) For the purposes of this section the expression 'native of India' includes any person born and domiciled in British India, of parents habitually resident in British India, and not established there for temporary purposes only; and the Governor-General in Council may by resolution define and limit the qualification of natives of India thus expressed; but every resolution made by him for that purpose will be subject to the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council, and will not have force until it has been laid for thirty days before both Houses of Parliament.

The enactment reproduced by this section is not very clearly expressed, and runs as follows:—

'Whereas it is expedient that additional facilities should be given for the employment of natives in India, of proved merit and ability, in the civil service of Her Majesty in India: Be it enacted, that nothing in the Government of India Act, 1858, or in the Indian Civil Service Act, 1861, or in any other Act of Parliament or other law now in force in India, shall restrain the authorities in India by whom appointments are or may be made to offices, places, and employments in the civil service of Her Majesty in India from appointing any native of India to any such office, place, or employment, although such native shall not have been admitted to the said Civil Service of India in manner in s. 32 of the first-mentioned Act provided, but subject to such rules as may be from time to time prescribed by the Governor-General in Council and sanctioned by the Secretary of State in Council, with the concurrence of a majority of members present; and that for the purpose of this Act the words "natives of India" shall include any person born or domiciled within the dominions of Her Majesty in India, of parents habitually resident in India, and not established there for temporary purposes only; and that it shall be lawful for the Governor-General in Council to define and limit from time to time the qualification of natives of India thus expressed; provided that every resolution made by him for such purpose shall be subject to the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council, and shall not have force until it has been laid for thirty days before both Houses of Parliament.'

For the history of the successive rules made under this section, see above, p. 124. The expression 'native of India' as defined by the section is construed as including persons born or domiciled in a Native State.

95.—(1) Where it appears to the authority in India by whom an appointment is to be made to any office reserved to members of the Civil Service of India, that a person not being a member of that service ought, under the special circumstances of the case, to be appointed thereto, the authority may appoint thereto any person who has resided for at least seven years in India, and who has, before his appointment, fulfilled all the tests (if any) which would be imposed in the like case on a member of that service.

Power to make provisional appointments in certain cases. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, ss. 3, 4.]

(2) Every such appointment is provisional only, and must forthwith be reported to the Secretary of State in Council, with the special reasons for making it; and unless the Secretary of State in Council approves the appointment, with the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of the Council of India, and within twelve months from the date of the appointment notifies such approval to the authority by whom the appointment was made, the appointment must be cancelled.

PART IX.

THE INDIAN HIGH COURTS.

Constitution.

96.—(1) (a) Each high court consists of a chief justice, and as many judges, not exceeding fifteen (b), as His Majesty may think fit to appoint.

Constitution of high courts. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, ss. 2, 19.]

(2) A judge of a high court must be—

(a) A barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, of not less than five years' standing; or

(b) A member of the Civil Service of India of not less than ten years' standing, and having for at least three years served as or exercised the powers of a district judge; or

(c) A person having held judicial office not inferior to that of a subordinate judge, or a judge of a small cause court, for a period of not less than five years; or

(d) A person having been a pleader (c) of a high court for a period of not less than ten years.

(3) Provided that not less than one-third of the judges of a high court, including the chief justice, must be such barristers or advocates as aforesaid, and that not less than one-third must be members of the Civil Service of India.

(a) There are four chartered high courts: at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Allahabad.

(b) There is power in all cases to raise the number to this maximum.

(c) The word 'pleader' in the enactment reproduced by this section apparently includes every one who has for ten years been allowed to 'plead' in the Indian sense, i. e. to act as a barrister in the high court, though not a barrister or member of the Faculty of Advocates.

97.—(1) Every judge of a high court holds his office during His Majesty's pleasure (a).

(2) Any such judge may resign his office, in the case of the high court at Calcutta, to the Governor-General in Council, and in the case of any other high court to the local Government of the province in which the high court is established.

(a) As to tenure during pleasure, see the note on s. 21 above.

98.—(1) The chief justice of a high court has rank and precedence before the other judges of the same court.

(2) All the other judges of a high court have rank and precedence according to the seniority of their appointments, unless otherwise provided by the terms of their appointment.

99. The Secretary of State in Council may fix the salaries, allowances, furloughs, retiring pensions, and (where necessary) expenses for equipment and voyage of the chief justices and judges of the several high courts, and from time to time alter them, but any such alteration does not affect the salary of any judge appointed before the date thereof.

For existing salaries and allowances, see note on s. 80.

100.—(1) On the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of chief justice of a high court, and during any absence of such a chief justice, the Governor-General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta, and the local Govern-

Tenure of office of judges of high courts.

[24 & 25 Vict. c. 204, s. 4.]

Precedence of judges of high courts.

[24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 5.]

Salaries, &c., of judges of high courts.

[24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 6.]

Provision for vacancy in the office of chief justice or

ment in other cases, is to appoint one of the judges of the same high court to perform the duties of chief justice of the court until some person has been appointed by His Majesty to the office of chief justice of the court, and has entered on the discharge of the duties of that office, or until the chief justice has returned from his absence, as the case requires (a).

other
judge.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
104, s. 7.]

(2) On the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of any other judge of any such high court, and during any absence of any such judge, or on the appointment of any such judge to act as chief justice, the Governor-General in Council or local Government, as the case may be, may appoint a person, with such qualifications as are required in persons to be appointed to the high court, to act as a judge of the high court; and the person so appointed may sit and perform the duties of a judge of the court until some person has been appointed by His Majesty to the office of judge of the court, and has entered on the discharge of the duties of the office, or until the absent judge has returned from his absence, or until the Governor-General in Council or local Government sees cause to cancel the appointment of the acting judge (b).

(a) Apparently the person appointed to act for the chief justice need not be a barrister-judge, though the chief justice himself must be a barrister. See s. 97 above.

(b) The appointment remains in force until the occurrence of one of the contingencies mentioned in this sub-section, and hence cannot be made for a specified time. Probably the 'acting judge' referred to at the end of the sub-section is the judge acting as chief justice referred to above. There is no limit of time within which the appointment must be made. See *Rao Balwant Singh v. Rani Kishori* L. R. 25 I. A. 54, 76.

Jurisdiction.

101.—(1) Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council (a), the several high courts have such jurisdiction, original and appellate, including admiralty jurisdiction in respect of offences committed on the high seas, and all such powers and authority over or in relation to the administration of justice, including power to appoint clerks and other ministerial officers of the court, and power to make

Jurisdiction
of high
courts.
[13 Geo.
III, c. 63,
ss. 13, 14.
21 Geo.
III, c. 70,
s. 8.
33 Geo.
III, c. 52,

perhaps, be most fitly terminated by the grant of the *diwani* in 1765, when the Company become practically sovereigns of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa.

During the second period, from 1765 to 1858, the Company are territorial sovereigns, sharing their sovereignty in diminishing proportions with the Crown, and gradually losing their mercantile privileges and functions. This period may, with reference to its greater portion, be described as the period of double government, using the phrase in the sense in which it was commonly applied to the system abolished by the Act of 1858. The first direct interference of Parliament with the government of India is in 1773, and the Board of Control is established in 1784.

The third and last period, the period of government by the Crown, begins with 1858, when, as an immediate consequence of the Mutiny of 1857, the remaining powers of the East India Company are transferred to the Crown.

In each of these periods a few dates may be selected as convenient landmarks.

Land-
marks of
first
period.

The first period is the period of charters. The charter of 1600 was continued and supplemented by other charters, of which the most important were James I's charter of 1609, Charles II's charter of 1661, James II's charter of 1686, and William III's charters of 1693 and 1698.

The rivalry between the Old or 'London' Company and the New or 'English' Company was terminated by the fusion of the two Companies under Godolphin's Award of 1708.

The wars with the French in Southern India between 1745 and 1761 and the battles of Plassey (1757) and Baxar (1764) in Northern India indicate the transition to the second period.

Land-
marks of
second
period.

The main stages of the second period are marked by Acts of Parliament, occurring with one exception at regular intervals of twenty years.

North's Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63) was followed by the Charter Acts of 1793, 1813, 1833, and 1853. The exceptional Act is Pitt's Act of 1784.

s. 156. rules for regulating the practice of the court, as are vested in
 37 Geo. them by charter, and subject to the provisions of any such
 III, c. law or charter, all such jurisdiction, powers, and authority as
 142, s. II. were vested in any of the courts in the same presidency
 39 & 40 Geo. III, abolished by the Indian High Courts Act, 1861, at the date
 c. 79, ss. of their abolition (b).
 2, 5.
 4 Geo. IV,
 c. 71, ss.
 7, 17.
 24 & 25
 Vict. c.
 104, s. 9.]

(2) Each of the high courts at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay is a court of record and a court of oyer and terminer and gaol delivery for the territories under its jurisdiction.

(3) Subject to any law which may be made by the Governor-General in Council, the said high courts have not and may not exercise any original jurisdiction in any matter concerning the revenue or concerning any act ordered or done in the collection thereof according to the usage and practice of the country or the regulations for the time being in force (c).

(a) This power is reserved by s. 9 of the Indian High Courts Act, 1861.

(b) The jurisdiction of the chartered high courts in India is based partly on their charters and partly on parliamentary enactments applying either to the high courts themselves or to their predecessors.

The charters are to be found in the Statutory Rules and Orders Revised, Vol. VI.

The statutory enactments still unrepealed with respect to the jurisdiction of the high court are as follows :—

By s. 13 of the Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63) the Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William was declared to have full power and authority to exercise and perform all civil, criminal, admiralty, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to appoint clerks and other ministerial officers, and to form and establish such rules of practice, and such rules for the process of the court, and to do all such things as might be found necessary for the administration of justice and the due execution of all or any of the powers which by the charter might be granted and committed to the court. It was also to be at all times a court of record and a court of oyer and terminer and gaol delivery in and for the town of Calcutta and factory of Fort William, and the limits thereof, and the factories subordinate thereto.

Under s. 14 of the same Act, the new charter of the court, and the jurisdiction, powers, and authorities to be thereby established, were to extend to all British subjects who should reside in the kingdoms or provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, or any of them, under the protection of the Company, and the court was to have full power and authority to hear and determine all complaints against any of His Majesty's subjects for any crime, misdemeanours, or oppressions, and

to entertain, hear, and determine any suits or actions whatsoever against any of His Majesty's subjects in Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, and any suit, action, or complaint against any person who at the time when the debt or cause of action or complaint had arisen had been employed by, or been directly or indirectly in the service of, the Company, or of any of His Majesty's subjects.

Section 156 of the East India Company Act, 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52), enacted and declared that the power and authority of the supreme court at Calcutta extended to the high seas, and that the court should have full power and authority to inquire, hear, try, examine, and determine, by the oaths of honest and lawful men, being British subjects resident in the town of Calcutta, all treasons, murders, piracies, robberies, felonies, maimings, forestallings, extortions, trespasses, misdemeanours, offences, excesses, and enormities, and maritime causes whatsoever, according to the laws and customs of the Admiralty of England, done, perpetrated, or committed upon any of the high seas, and to fine, imprison, correct, punish, chastise, and reform parties guilty and violators of the laws, in like and in as ample manner to all intents and purposes as the said court might or could do if the same were done, perpetrated, or committed within the limits prescribed by the charter, and not otherwise or in any other manner.

The East India Act, 1797 (37 Geo. III, c. 142), after providing for the erection of courts of judicature at Madras and Bombay, gave those courts, by s. 11, the jurisdiction formerly exercisable by the mayor's court at Madras and at Bombay, or by the courts of oyer and terminer or gaol delivery there, and declared, by s. 13, that these courts were to have full power to hear and determine all suits and actions that might be brought against the inhabitants of Madras and Bombay respectively in manner provided by the charter, subject however to the proviso in s. 108 of this Digest.

The Government of India Act, 1800 (39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 78), authorized the grant of a charter for the establishment of a supreme court at Madras. It was (s. 2) to have full power to exercise such civil, criminal, admiralty, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, both as to natives and British subjects, and to be invested with such powers and authorities, privileges and immunities, for the better administration of the same, and to be subject to the same limitations, restrictions, and control within Fort St. George and the town of Madras, and the limits thereof, and the factories subordinate thereto, and within the territories subject to or dependent on the Government of Madras, as the supreme court at Fort William was invested with or subject to within Fort William or the kingdoms or provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa.

The Indian Bishops and Courts Act, 1823 (4 Geo. IV, c. 71, s. 7), authorized the grant of a charter for the establishment of a supreme court at Bombay with jurisdiction corresponding to that previously given to the supreme court at Madras, and declared, by s. 17, that the supreme courts at Madras and Bombay were to have the same powers as the supreme court at Fort William in Bengal.

In 1828 an Act (9 Geo. IV, c. 74) was passed for improving the administration of criminal justice in the East Indies. The only sections now unrepealed in this Act are ss. 1, 7, 8, 9, 25, 26, 56, and 110. By s. 1 the Act is declared to extend to all persons and all places, as well on land as on the high seas, over whom or which the criminal jurisdiction of any of His Majesty's courts of justice erected or to be erected within the British territories under the government of the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies does or shall hereafter extend. Sections 7, 8, and 9, which relate to accessories, and s. 52, which relates to punishments, are apparently superseded as to admiralty cases by the Admiralty Offences (Colonial) Act, 1849 (12 & 13 Vict. c. 96), and the Admiralty Jurisdiction (India) Act, 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 88) (see *The Queen Empress v. Barton*, 1 L. R. 16 Cal. 238), and as to other cases by the Indian Codes.

Section 26 lays down a rule for interpreting criminal statutes, corresponding to the rule embodied for India in the General Clauses Act of 1897, and for the United Kingdom in the Interpretation Act, 1889.

Section 56 extends to British India the provisions previously enacted for England by 9 Geo. IV, c. 31, s. 8, with respect to offences committed in two different places, or partially committed in one place and completed in another, but has been held not to make any person liable to punishment for a complete offence who would not have been so liable before. See *Nga Hoong v. Reg.*, 7 Moo. Ind. App. 72, 7 Cox C.C. 480. In this case some Burmese native subjects of the East India Company committed a murder on the Cocos Islands, which were then uninhabited islands in the Bay of Bengal, within the limits of the Company's charter. They were convicted under the Act of 1828 by the supreme court of Calcutta, but the conviction was reversed by the Privy Council. It was held that the place in which the offence was committed was, but the offenders personally were not, within the jurisdiction conferred by the statute, and that the object of the statute was only to apply to the East Indies the enactment previously passed for England.

Section 110 of the Act of 1828 has been repealed, except so far as it is in force in the Straits Settlements.

The Admiralty Offences (Colonial) Act, 1849 (12 & 13 Vict. c. 96), enacts that if any person within any colony (which is to include British India, 23 & 24 Vict. c. 88, s. 1) is charged with the commission of any offence committed upon the sea or in any haven, river, creek, or place where the admiral has jurisdiction, or being so charged is brought for trial to any colony, all magistrates, justices of the peace, public prosecutors, juries, judges, courts, public officers, and other persons in the colony are to have the same jurisdiction and authority with respect to the offence as if the offence had been committed upon any waters situate within the limits of the local jurisdiction of the courts of criminal justice of the colony.

The Act further enacts (s. 3) that where any person dies in any colony of any stroke, poisoning, or hurt, having been feloniously stricken, poisoned, or hurt upon the sea, or in any haven, river, creek, or place

where the admiral has jurisdiction, or at any place out of the colony, every offence committed in respect of any such case, whether amounting to the offence of murder or of manslaughter, or of being accessory before the fact to murder, or after the fact to murder or manslaughter, may be dealt with and punished in the colony as if the offence had been wholly committed in the colony; and if any person is charged in any colony with any such offence resulting in death on the sea, or in any such haven, &c., the offence is to be held for the purposes of the Act to have been wholly committed upon the sea.

The Admiralty Jurisdiction (India) Act, 1860 (23 & 24 Vict. c. 88), provides (s. 2) that where any person within any place in India is charged with the commission of any offence in respect of which jurisdiction is given by the Act of 1849, or, being so charged, is brought for trial under that Act to any place in India, if before his trial he makes it appear that if the offence charged had been committed in that place he could have been tried only in the supreme court of one of the three presidencies in India, and claims to be so tried, the fact is to be certified, and he is to be sent for trial and tried accordingly.

The Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), abolished the supreme courts at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and the Company's courts of appeal at those places, and provided for the establishment by charter of high courts at those places.

Under s. 9, 'each of the high courts to be established under this Act shall have and exercise all such civil, criminal, admiralty and vice-admiralty, testamentary, intestate, and matrimonial jurisdiction, original and appellate, and all such powers and authority for and in relation to the administration of justice in the presidency for which it is established, as Her Majesty may by such letters patent as aforesaid grant and direct; subject, however, to such directions and limitations as to the exercise of original, civil, and criminal jurisdiction beyond the limits of the presidency towns as may be prescribed thereby, and save as by such letters patent may be otherwise directed; and, subject and without prejudice to the legislative powers in relation to the matters aforesaid of the Governor-General of India in Council, the high court to be established in each presidency shall have and exercise all jurisdiction, and every power and authority whatsoever in any manner vested in any of the courts in the same presidency abolished under this Act at the time of the abolition of such last-mentioned courts.'

Section 11 declares that the existing provisions applicable to the supreme courts are to apply to the high courts.

The Courts (Colonial) Jurisdiction Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 27), enacts, by s. 3, that when, by virtue of any Act of Parliament, a person is tried in a court of any colony (which by s. 2 is to include British India) for any crime or offence committed upon the high seas or elsewhere out of the territorial limits of the colony and of the local jurisdiction of the court, or, if committed within that local jurisdiction, made punishable by that Act, he shall, upon conviction, be liable to

such punishment as might have been inflicted upon him if the crime or offence had been committed within the limits of the colony and of the local jurisdiction of the court, and to no other. Provided that if the crime or offence is not punishable by the law of the colony in which the trial takes place, the person shall, on conviction, be liable to such punishment (other than capital punishment) as seems to the court most nearly to correspond to the punishment to which he would have been liable if the crime or offence had been tried in England.

The Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Act, 1878 (41 & 42 Vict. c. 73), which was passed in consequence of the decision in the *Franconia* case (*R. v. Keyn*, 2 Ex. 169), and which extends to India, declares that an offence committed by a person, whether he is or is not a subject of Her Majesty, on the open sea within the territorial waters of Her Majesty's dominions, is an offence within the jurisdiction of the admiral, although it may have been committed on board or by means of a foreign ship, and the person who committed the offence may be arrested, tried, and punished accordingly. Proceedings for the trial and punishment of a person who is not a subject of Her Majesty, and is charged with any such offence as is declared by the Act to be within the jurisdiction of the admiral, are not to be instituted in British India except with the leave of the governor-general or the governor of the presidency. For the purpose of any offence declared by the Act to be within the jurisdiction of the admiral, any part of the sea within one marine league of the coast, measured from low-water mark, is to be deemed to be open sea within the territorial waters of Her Majesty's dominions.

Under the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 27), the Legislature of British India may declare certain courts to be colonial courts of admiralty, and courts so declared have the admiralty jurisdiction described in the Act. Under this power the Legislature of India has, by Act XVI of 1891, s. 2, declared the high courts at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, as well as the courts of the recorder at Rangoon, the Resident at Aden, and the district court of Karachi, to be colonial courts of admiralty.

The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict. c. 60), provides, by s. 686, that 'where any person, being a British subject, is charged with having committed any offence on board any British ship on the high seas or in any foreign port or harbour, or on board any foreign ship to which he does not belong, or, not being a British subject, is charged with having committed any offence on board any British ship on the high seas, and that person is found within the jurisdiction of any court in Her Majesty's dominions which would have had cognizance of the offence if it had been committed on board a British ship within the limits of its ordinary jurisdiction, that court shall have jurisdiction to try the offence as if it had been so committed; but nothing in this section is to affect the Admiralty Offences (Colonial) Act, 1849.'

Section 687 of the same Act provides that 'all offences against property or person committed in or at any place, either ashore or afloat, out of Her Majesty's dominions by any master, seaman, or

apprentice who, at the time when the offence is committed, is, or within three months previously has been, employed in any British ship, shall be deemed to be offences of the same nature respectively, and be liable to the same punishments respectively, and be inquired of, heard, tried, determined, and adjudged in the same manner and by the same courts and in the same places as if those offences had been committed within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty of England; and the costs and expenses of the prosecution of any such offence may be directed to be paid as in the case of costs and expenses of prosecutions for offences committed within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty of England.'

It seems to follow from these several enactments, and from pars. 29 and 32 of the Charters, that where a chartered high court exercises jurisdiction in respect of—

- (1) an offence committed on land, both the procedure and the substantive law to be applied are those of British India, i. e. both the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Penal Code apply;
- (2) an offence committed at sea by a native of British India, the position is the same;
- (3) an offence committed at sea by any other person, whether within territorial waters or beyond them, the procedure is regulated by British Indian law, but the nature of the crime and the punishment are determined by English law.

See *Queen Empress v. Barton*, I. L. R. 16 Cal. 238, and Mayne, *Criminal Law of India*, chap. ii.

(c) The enactment reproduced by this sub-section was probably suggested by the Patna case, as to which see Stephen's *Nuncomer and Impey*, chap. xii. In 1873 certain licensed liquor-vendors moved the high court at Calcutta for a mandamus to compel the Board of Revenue to issue rules prescribing the fees payable for liquor licences, but it was held that the matter related wholly to the revenue, and that therefore by 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 8, the high court had no jurisdiction (*Re Audur Chandra Shaw*, 11 Beng. L. R. 250). In a later Madras case (1876) doubts were expressed as to the extent to which the enactment was still in force, and, in particular, whether it had not been repealed except as to land revenue. See *Collector of Sea Customs v. Panniar Chithambaram*, I. L. R. 1 Mad. 89. In any case it applies only to the jurisdiction derived from the supreme court, i. e. to the original jurisdiction.

102. Each of the high courts has superintendence over all courts for the time being subject to its appellate jurisdiction, and may do any of the following things; that is to say—

- (a) call for returns;
- (b) direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such court to any other court of equal or superior jurisdiction;

Powers of high court with respect to subordinate courts. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 15.]

- (c) make and issue general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of such courts,
- (d) prescribe forms for any proceedings in such courts, and for the mode of keeping any books, entries, or accounts by the officers of any such courts : and
- (e) settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriffs, attorneys, and all clerks and officers of such courts.

Provided that all such rules, forms, and tables require the previous approval, in the province of Bengal of the Governor-General in Council, and in the province of Madras or Bombay or the North-Western Provinces of the local Government (a).

(a) As to the relations of the high courts to the subordinate courts, see further above, pp. 127, 136.

Exercise of jurisdiction by single judges or division courts.
[24 & 25 Viet. c. 104, ss. 13, 14.]

103.—(1) Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council, each high court may by its own rules provide as it thinks fit for the exercise, by one or more judges, or by division courts constituted by two or more judges of the high court, of the original and appellate jurisdiction vested in the court.

(2) The chief justice of each high court determines what judge in each case is to sit alone, and what judges of the court, whether with or without the chief justice, are to constitute the several division courts.

Power for Governor-General in Council to alter local limits of jurisdiction of high courts.
[28 & 29 Viet. c. 15, ss. 3, 4, 6.]

104.—(1) (a) The Governor-General in Council may by order transfer any territory or place from the jurisdiction of one to the jurisdiction of any other of the high courts, and authorize any high court to exercise all or any portion of its jurisdiction in any part of British India not included within the limits for which the high court was established (b), and also to exercise any such jurisdiction in respect of Christian (c) subjects of His Majesty resident in any part of India outside British India (b).

(2) The Governor-General in Council must transmit to the Secretary of State an authentic copy of every order made under this section.

(3) His Majesty may signify, through the Secretary of State in Council, his disallowance of any such order, and such disallowance makes void and annuls the order as from the day on which the governor-general makes known by proclamation or by signification to his council that he has received notification of the disallowance, but no act done by any high court before such notification is invalid by reason only of such disallowance.

(4) Nothing in this section affects any power of the Governor-General in Council in legislative meetings.

(a) As to the object and construction of this section, see Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 45.

(b) For orders made under this provision, see Notifications, Nos. 178, 180, 181, of September 23, 1874; Mayne, *Criminal Law of India*, p. 258. It would seem that s. 3 of the Act of 1865 (reproduced by this provision) only empowered the governor-general to make an order transferring any territory from the jurisdiction of one court to the jurisdiction of another, and that the second branch of the section was only to enable the governor-general to authorize the court to which such transfer was made to exercise jurisdiction. If this is so, the Governor-General in Council could not either by order or legislation extend the local and personal jurisdiction of the high court at Allahabad over the province of Oudh, or authorize two of the judges of the high court to sit at Lucknow to try cases arising in Oudh, or empower the Chief Commissioner of Oudh to transmit cases from Oudh for trial at Allahabad by judges of the high court there.

(c) 'The comprehensive term "Christian" was doubtless used because it might be convenient to give a particular high court matrimonial and testamentary jurisdiction over all Christian subjects.' Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, Nos. 44, 45.

(d) i.e. in Native States. See s. 124.

105.—(1) Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council (a), the governor-general and each of the governors of Madras and Bombay, and each of the ordinary and extraordinary members of their respective councils, is not—

(a) subject to the original jurisdiction of any high court by reason of anything counselled, ordered, or done by any of them, in his public capacity only; nor

(b) liable to be arrested or imprisoned in any suit or proceeding in any high court acting in the exercise of its original jurisdiction; nor

Exemption from jurisdiction of high court in public capacity. [13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 15, 17. 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 1. 37 Geo. III, c. 142.]

(3) His Majesty may signify, through the Secretary of State in Council, his disallowance of any such order, and such disallowance makes void and annuls the order as from the day on which the governor-general makes known by proclamation or by signification to his council that he has received notification of the disallowance, but no act done by any high court before such notification is invalid by reason only of such disallowance.

(4) Nothing in this section affects any power of the Governor-General in Council in legislative meetings.

(a) As to the object and construction of this section, see Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 45.

(b) For orders made under this provision, see Notifications, Nos. 178, 180, 181, of September 23, 1874; Mayne, *Criminal Law of India*, p. 258. It would seem that s. 3 of the Act of 1865 (reproduced by this provision) only empowered the governor-general to make an order transferring any territory from the jurisdiction of one court to the jurisdiction of another, and that the second branch of the section was only to enable the governor-general to authorize the court to which such transfer was made to exercise jurisdiction. If this is so, the Governor-General in Council could not either by order or legislation extend the local and personal jurisdiction of the high court at Allahabad over the province of Oudh, or authorize two of the judges of the high court to sit at Lucknow to try cases arising in Oudh, or empower the Chief Commissioner of Oudh to transmit cases from Oudh for trial at Allahabad by judges of the high court there.

(c) 'The comprehensive term "Christian" was doubtless used because it might be convenient to give a particular high court matrimonial and testamentary jurisdiction over all Christian subjects.' Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, Nos. 44, 45.

(d) i.e. in Native States. See s. 124.

105.—(1) Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council (a), the governor-general and each of the governors of Madras and Bombay, and each of the ordinary and extraordinary members of their respective councils, is not—

(a) subject to the original jurisdiction of any high court by reason of anything counselled, ordered, or done by any of them, in his public capacity only; nor

(b) liable to be arrested or imprisoned in any suit or proceeding in any high court acting in the exercise of its original jurisdiction; nor

Exemption from jurisdiction of high court in public capacity. [13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 15, 17, 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 1. 37 Geo. III, c. 142,

S. II.

39 & 40

Geo. III,

c. 79, s. 3.

4 Geo. IV,

c. 41, s. 7.]

(c) subject to the original criminal jurisdiction of any high court in respect of any misdemeanour at common law, or under any Act of Parliament, or in respect of any act which if done in England would have been a misdemeanour.

(2) The exemption under this section from liability to arrest and imprisonment extends also to the chief justices and other judges of the several high courts.

(a) The enactments reproduced by this section apply only to the original jurisdiction of the high courts, and are not excepted from the legislative power of the governor-general's council by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22. The exemptions from jurisdiction granted by 21 Geo. III, c. 70, and reproduced in this section, were granted in consequence of the proceedings in the *Cossijurah* case. See above, p. 54; *Mayne, Criminal Law of India*, p. 301; and *Jehangir v. Secretary of State for India*, I. L. R. 27 Bom. 180.

Written
order by
governor-
general a
justifica-
tion for
any act
in any
court in
India.

[21 Geo.
III, c. 70,
ss. 2, 3, 4.]

106. Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council, the order in writing of the Governor-General in Council for any act is in any proceeding, civil or criminal, in any high court acting in the exercise of its original jurisdiction, a full justification of the act, except so far as the act extends to any [European] British subject of His Majesty (a); but nothing in this section exempts the governor-general, or any member of his council, or any person acting under their orders, from any proceedings in respect of any such act before any competent court in England.

(a) The expression in the Act of 1780 is 'British subjects,' which of course must be construed in the narrower sense. As to the circumstances out of which this enactment arose, see above, pp. 54 foll., and *Mill's British India*, iv. 373-375; *Cowell's Tagore Lectures*, p. 72; *Nuncmar and Impey*, ii. 189. As to the limitations formerly imposed on the powers of the Indian Governments in dealing with European British subjects, see *In re Amcer Khan*, 6 B. L. R. 446, and the notes on ss. 63 and 79 of this Digest. The enactments reproduced by this section do not apply to the Governments of Madras and Bombay. They are applied to the existing high courts by the conjoint operation of 39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79, s. 3; 4 Geo. IV, c. 71, s. 7; and 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 11, but appear to affect only the original jurisdiction of the high courts.

Procedure
in case of
oppres-
sion, &c.,

107.—(1) (a) Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council, if any person makes a complaint in writing, and on oath, to the high court at Calcutta of any

The Regulating Act organized the government of the Bengal Presidency and established the Supreme Court at Calcutta.

The Act of 1784 (24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25) established the Board of Control.

The Charter Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52) made no material change in the constitution of the Indian Government, but happened to be contemporaneous with the permanent settlement of Bengal.

The Charter Act of 1813 (53 Geo. III, c. 155) threw open the trade to India, whilst reserving to the Company the monopoly of the China trade.

The Charter Act of 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85) terminated altogether the trading functions of the Company.

The Charter Act of 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95) took away from the Court of Directors the patronage of posts in their service, and threw open the covenanted civil service to general competition.

The third period was ushered in by the Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106), which declared that India was to be governed by and in the name of Her Majesty. ^{marks of third period.} The change was announced in India by the Queen's Proclamation of November 1, 1858. The legislative councils and the high courts were established on their present basis by two Acts of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. cc. 67, 104). Since that date Parliamentary legislation for India has been confined to matters of detail. The East India Company was not formally dissolved until 1874.

The first charter of the East India Company was granted on December 31, 1600. The circumstances in which the grant of this charter arose have been well described by Sir A. Lyall¹. The customary trade routes from Europe to the East had been closed by the Turkish Sultan. Another route had been opened by the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope. Thus the trade with the East had been transferred from the cities and states on the Mediterranean to the states on the

Charter of Elizabeth.

¹ *British Dominion in India.*

oppression or injury alleged to have been caused by any order by governor-general, or any member of his council, and gives security to the satisfaction of the high court to prosecute his complaint by indictment, information, or action before a competent court in the United Kingdom within two years from the making of the same or from the return into the United Kingdom of the person or persons complained against, he is entitled to have a true copy of any order of which he complains produced before the high court, and authenticated by the court, and he and the persons against whom he complains may examine witnesses on the matter of the complaint.

(2) The high court must, if necessary, compel the attendance and examination of witnesses in any such case in the same manner as in other criminal or civil proceedings.

(3) Sections forty to forty-five of the East India Company Act, 1772, apply in the case of proceedings under this section as in the case of the proceedings referred to in those sections.

(a) The provision reproduced by this section has remained a dead letter from the date of its enactment, appears to be unnecessary, and could be repealed by Indian legislation. It does not apply to the Madras High Court, *Re Wallace*, I. L. R. 8 Mad. 24.

The sections referred to in sub-section (3) give jurisdiction to the Court of King's Bench, now the High Court, and provide for the taking of evidence in India, and its admissibility in England.

Law to be administered.

108. Subject to any law made by the Governor-General in Council, the high courts, in the exercise of their original jurisdiction, shall, in matters of inheritance and succession to lands, rents, and goods, and in matters of contract and dealing between party and party, when both parties are subject to the same personal law or custom having the force of law, decide according to that personal law or custom, and when the parties are subject to different personal laws or custom having the force of law, decide according to the law or custom to which the defendant is subject.

by governor-general or his council.
[21 Geo. III, c. 70, ss. 5, 6.]

13 Geo. III, c. 63.

Law to be administered in cases of inheritance and succession.
[21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 17.
37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 13.]

This section reproduces the enactments marginally noted so far as they appear to represent existing law. The qualifying words at the beginning of the clause represent existing law, the enactments marginally noted being, under 24 & 25 Viet. c. 67, s. 22, capable of being altered by Indian legislation.

In Warren Hastings' celebrated plan for the administration of justice, proposed and adopted in 1772, when the East India Company first took upon themselves the entire management of their territories in India, the twenty-third rule specially reserved their own laws to the natives, and provided that 'Moulavies or Brahmins' should respectively attend the courts to expound the law and assist in passing the decree.

Subsequently, when the governor-general and council were invested by Parliament with the power of making regulations, the provisions and exact words of Warren Hastings' twenty-third rule were introduced into the first regulation enacted by the Bengal Government for the administration of justice. This regulation was passed on April 17, 1780.

By section 27 of this regulation it was enacted 'that in all suits regarding inheritance, marriage, and caste, and other religious usages or institutions, the laws of the Koran with respect to Mahomedans, and those of the Shaster with respect to Gentoos, shall be invariably adhered to.' This section was re-enacted in the following year, in the revised Code, with the addition of the word 'succession.' Section 17 of the Act of 1781 constitutes the first express recognition of Warren Hastings' rule in the English Statute Law. Enactments to the same effect have since been introduced into numerous subsequent English statutes and Indian Acts,—see, for example, 37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 13; Bombay Regulation IV of 1827, s. 26; Act IV of 1872, s. 5 (Punjab) as amended by Act XII of 1878; Act III of 1873, s. 16 (Madras); Act XX of 1875, s. 5 (Central Provinces); Act XVIII of 1876, s. 3 (Oudh); Act XII of 1887, s. 37 (Bengal, North-Western Provinces, and Assam); Act XI of 1889, s. 4 (Lower Burma). See also clauses 19 and 20 of the Charter of 1865 of the Bengal High Court, the corresponding clauses of the Madras and Bombay Charters, and clauses 13 and 14 of the Charter of the North-Western Provinces High Court.

The effect of 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 17, is explained in *Sarkies v. Prosonno Mayi Dasi*, 1 L. R. 6 Cal. 704 (application for dower by the widow of an Armenian), and *Jagat Mohini Dasi v. Dwarkanath Beisakh*, 1 L. R. 8 Cal. 582 (where it was held that there was no question of succession or inheritance).

The Indian Contract Act (IV of 1872) contains a saving (s. 2) for any statute, Act, or regulation not thereby expressly repealed. This saving has been held to include the enactment reproduced by this section, under which matters of contract are, within the presidency towns, but not elsewhere, directed to be regulated by the personal law of the party, and thus, paradoxically enough, certain rules of Hindu law have maintained their footing in the last part of British India where they might have been expected to survive. See *Nobin Chunder*

Bannerjee v. Romesh Chunder Ghose, I. L. R. 14 Cal. 781, where it was held that the custom of *damdapat* (*Law Quarterly Review* for 1896, p. 45) was still in force in Calcutta. If, however, any native law or custom is already inconsistent with the terms of the Contract Act, it would be held to be repealed. See *Madhab Chunder Poranamah v. Rajcoomar Doss*, 14 Beng. Law Rep. 76, p. 4.

The leading case on the extent to which English law has been introduced into India is the *Mayor of Lyons v. East India Company* (1836), reported 1 Moo. P. C. 176, and also, with useful explanatory and illustrative matter, 3 State Trials, N. S. 647. The Judicial Committee in this case laid down the principle that the general introduction of English law into a conquered or ceded country does not draw with it such parts as are manifestly inapplicable to the circumstances of the settlement, and decided in particular that the English law incapacitating aliens from holding real property to their own use and transmitting it by devise or descent had never been expressly introduced into Bengal, and that the Statute of Mortmain, 9 Geo. II, c. 36, did not apply to India. See also the famous judgement of Lord Stowell in *The Indian Chief*, (1800) 3 Rob. Adm. 12 at pp. 28, 29 (quoted below, p. 354); *Freeman v. Fairlie*, (1828) 1 Moo. Ind. App. 304, 2 State Trials, N. S. 1000; *Advocate-General of Bengal v. Ramee Surnomoye Dossee*, (1863) 2 Moo. P. C. N. S. 22 (law as to forfeiture for suicide); and *Ram Coomarr Coondoo v. Chunder Canto Mookerjee*, (1876) L. R. 2 App. Cas. 186 (law as to maintenance and champerty). And as to the effect of successive charters in introducing English law into India, see above, p. 34; Morley's *Digest*, Introduction, pp. xi, xxiii; and Mr. Whitley Stokes' preface to the first edition of the older statutes relating to India (reprinted in the edition of 1881).

Advocate-General.

109.—(1) His Majesty may, by warrant under his Royal Sign Manual, appoint an advocate-general for each of the provinces of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay (a).

(2) The advocate-general for each of those provinces may take on behalf of His Majesty such proceedings as may be taken by His Majesty's Attorney-General in England (b).

(a) The advocate-general for Bengal is a law officer of the Government of India.

(b) See *Secretary of State for India v. Bombay Landing and Shipping Company*, 5 Bom. H. C. R. O. C. J., 42, and Act X of 1875, ss. 144, 146.

Appointment and powers of advocate-general.
[53 Geo. III, c. 155, s. III. 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 29.]

PART X.

ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Jurisdiction
of Indian
bishops.
[53 Geo.
III, c. 155,
ss. 51, 52,
3 & 4 Will.
IV, c. 85,
ss. 92, 93,
94.]

110.—(1) The bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay (a) have and may exercise such ecclesiastical jurisdiction and episcopal functions as His Majesty may, by letters patent, direct for the administering holy ceremonies, and for the superintendence and good government of the ministers of the Church of England within their respective dioceses.

(2) The Bishop of Calcutta is the metropolitan bishop in India, subject nevertheless to the general superintendence and revision of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

(3) Each of the bishops of Madras and Bombay is subject to the Bishop of Calcutta as such metropolitan, and must at the time of his appointment to his bishopric or at the time of his consecration as bishop take an oath of obedience to the Bishop of Calcutta in such manner as His Majesty by letters patent may be pleased to direct (b).

(4) His Majesty may, by letters patent, vary the limits of the dioceses of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.

[37 & 38
Vict. c. 77,
s. 13.]

(5) Nothing in this Digest or in any such letters patent as aforesaid prevents any person who is or has been bishop of any diocese in India from performing episcopal functions, not extending to the exercise of jurisdiction, in any diocese or reputed diocese at the request of the bishop thereof.

(a) The bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay are the only Indian bishops who are referred to in the Acts relating to India. Bishops have also been appointed, under letters patent or otherwise, for Chota Nagpore, Lahore, Lucknow, Rangoon, Tinnevely, and Travancore.

(b) As to these oaths, see 28 & 29 Vict. c. 122, and 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72, s. 14. Under 37 & 38 Vict. c. 77, s. 12, the archbishops of Canterbury or York may, in consecrating any person to the office of bishop for the purpose of exercising episcopal functions elsewhere than in England, dispense with the oath of due obedience to the archbishop.

Power to
admit to
holy
orders.

111.—(1) The Bishop of Calcutta may admit into the holy orders of deacon or priest any person whom he, on examination, deems duly qualified specially for the purpose of taking

on himself the cure of souls, or officiating in any spiritual capacity within the limits of the diocese of Calcutta, and residing therein. [4 Geo. IV. c. 71, s. 6.]

(2) The deposit with the bishop of a declaration of such a purpose, and a written engagement to perform the same, signed by the person seeking ordination, is a sufficient title with a view to his ordination.

(3) It must be distinctly stated in the letters of ordination of every person so admitted to holy orders that he has been ordained for the cure of souls within the limits of the diocese of Calcutta only.

(4) Unless a person so admitted is a British subject, he is not required to take the oaths and make the subscriptions which persons ordained in England are required to take and make (a).

(a) The enactment reproduced by this section appears to apply only to the Bishop of Calcutta, and is probably unnecessary, as being covered by the general language of the letters patent enabling the Bishop of Calcutta to perform all the functions peculiar and appropriate to the office of bishop within the diocese of Calcutta.

112. If any person under the degree of bishop is appointed to the bishopric of Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, being at the time of his appointment resident in India, the Archbishop of Canterbury, if so required to do by His Majesty by letters patent, may issue a commission under his hand and seal, directed to the two remaining bishops, authorizing and charging them to perform all requisite ceremonies for the consecration of the person so to be appointed. Consecration of person resident in India appointed to bishopric. [3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 99.]

113.—(1) There may be paid to the bishops and archdeacons of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, out of the revenues of India, such salaries (a), commencing from the time at which they take upon themselves the execution of their office, and such [pensions (b) and] allowances as may be fixed by the Secretary of State in Council, but any power of alteration under this enactment shall not be exercised so as to impose any additional charge on the revenues of India. Salaries and allowances of bishops and archdeacons. [53 Geo. III, c. 155, ss. 49, 50. 4 Geo. IV, c. 71, ss. 3, 4, 5. 3 & 4]

Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 90, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101. 5 & 6 Vict. c. 119, ss. 3, 4. 43 Viet. c. 3, ss. 2, 3.] (2) There are to be paid out of the revenues of India the expenses of visitations of the said bishops, and of the providing a suitable house for the residence of the Bishop of Calcutta (c), but no greater sum may be issued on account of those expenses than is allowed by the Secretary of State in Council.

(a) As to the existing salaries, see note on s. 80.

(b) This statement of the law is not strictly accurate. Pensions, as distinguished from allowances, appear to be still paid under 4 Geo. IV, c. 71, s. 3, 6 Geo. IV, c. 85, s. 15, and 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 90, and not under 43 Viet. c. 3, s. 3. But it seems hardly worth while to reproduce here the specific provisions about bishops' pensions.

(c) The statutory obligation to provide a house for the Bishop of Calcutta is exhausted, but it may have been construed as including an obligation to maintain his house.

Furlough rules.

[34 & 35

Vict. c. 62.]

114. His Majesty may make such rules as to the leave of absence of the several Indian bishops on furlough or medical certificate as seem to His Majesty expedient.

Establishment of chaplains of Church of Scotland.

[3 & 4

Will. IV,

c. 85, s.

102.]

115.—(1) Two of the chaplains appointed in each of the presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay must always be ministers of the Church of Scotland, and are entitled to have from the revenues of India such salary as is from time to time allotted to the military chaplains in the several presidencies.

(2) The ministers so appointed chaplains must be ordained and inducted by the presbytery of Edinburgh according to the forms and solemnities used in the Church of Scotland, and are subject to the spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction in all things of the presbytery of Edinburgh, whose judgements are subject to dissent, protest, and appeal to the Provincial Synod of Lothian and Tweeddale and to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Saving as to grants to Christians.

[3 & 4

Will. IV,

c. 85, s.

102.]

116. Nothing in this Digest prevents the Governor-General in Council from granting, with the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council, to any sect, persuasion, or community of Christians, not being of the Church of England or Church of Scotland, such sums of money as may be expedient for the purpose of instruction or for the maintenance of places of worship.

PART XI.

OFFENCES, PENALTIES, AND PROCEDURE.

117. If any person holding office under the Crown in India does any of the following things ; that is to say,—

- (1) If he oppresses any of His Majesty's subjects (a) within his jurisdiction or in the exercise of his authority : Certain acts to be misdemeanours: Oppression. [10 Geo. III, c. 47, s. 4.]
- (2) If (except in case of necessity, the burden of proving which shall be on him) he wilfully disobeys or wilfully omits, forbears, or neglects to execute any orders or instructions of the Secretary of State : Wilful disobedience. [33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 65.]
- (3) If he is guilty of any wilful breach of the trust and duty of his office and employment : 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 80.]
- (4) If, being the governor-general, or a governor, or a member of the council of the governor-general or of a governor, or being a person employed or concerned in the collection of revenue or the administration of justice, he is concerned in or has any dealings or transactions by way of traffic or trade in any part of India (b) [otherwise than as a shareholder in any joint-stock company or trading corporation] ; Breach of duty. [33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 65.]
- (5) If he accepts or receives for his own use, in the discharge of his office, any gift, gratuity, or reward, pecuniary or otherwise [except in accordance with rules made by the Secretary of State as to the receipt of presents], and except in the case of fees paid to barristers, physicians, surgeons, and chaplains in the way of their respective professions ; 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 80.]

he is guilty of a misdemeanour.

If a person is convicted of having accepted or received any such gift, gratuity, or reward, the court may order that the gift, gratuity, or reward, or any part thereof, be restored to the person who gave it, and that the whole or any part of any

Receiving presents. [13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 23, 24, 25.]

33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 62, 64.

3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76.]

fine imposed on the offender be paid or given to the prosecutor or informer, as the court may direct (c).

(a) The expression 'His Majesty's subjects' in the Act of 1770 (10 Geo. III, c. 47, s. 4) was used at a time when it was very doubtful how far the sovereignty of the British Crown extended over natives of India, at all events outside the presidency towns, and was possibly intended to be used in the narrower sense formerly attributed to the expression 'British subjects.' See note (c) on s. 63 above.

(b) The expression in the Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 137) is 'within any of the provinces of India or other parts.'

(c) This section reproduces with as much exactness as seems practicable the several enactments noted in the margin. In many cases enactments dealing with the same offence use different language, and apply to different classes of persons. The provisions reproduced from 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, cannot be altered by Indian legislation. See 21 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22.

The words 'otherwise than as a shareholder in any joint-stock company or trading corporation,' and 'except in accordance with rules made by the Secretary of State as to the receipt of presents,' do not occur in the enactments reproduced, but represent the limitations placed in practice on the extremely general language of the enactments.

Similar prohibitions of trading or lending money are contained in enactments of the Indian legislatures. See, e.g., Act XV of 1848 (trading by officers of chartered courts); Act II of 1874, s. 10 (by administrator-general); Acts VII of 1878, s. 74, and XIX of 1881, s. 73 (by forest officers); Acts V of 1861, s. 10, XXIV of 1859, s. 19; Bombay Act VII of 1867, s. 11 (by police officers); Acts XI of 1870, s. 34, and V of 1879, s. 3 (by officers of presidency banks); Act XVIII of 1881, s. 155; Bombay Act V of 1870, s. 31; Madras Regulation I of 1803, s. 40; Madras Regulation II of 1803, s. 64; Bengal Regulation II of 1793, s. 18 (by revenue officers); Bengal Regulation XXXVIII of 1793, s. 2 (loans by civil servants).

As to the rules prohibiting the receipt of presents by governors of and servants of the Crown in British Colonies, see Todd, *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies*, p. 153 (second edition).

Loans to
native
princes.
[37 Geo.
III, c. 142,
s. 28.]

118.—(1) If any British subject, without the previous consent in writing of the Secretary of State in Council or of the Governor-General in Council or of a local Government, by himself or another—

(a) lends any money or other valuable thing to any native prince in India; or

(b) is concerned in lending money to, or raising or procuring money for, any such native prince, or becomes security for the repayment of any such money; or

(c) lends any money or other valuable thing to any other person for the purpose of being lent to any such native prince ; or

(d) takes, holds, or is concerned in any bond, note, or other security granted by any such native prince for the repayment of any loan or money hereinbefore referred to,

he is guilty of a misdemeanour.

(2) Every bond, note, or security for money, of what kind or nature soever, taken, held, or enjoyed, either directly or indirectly, for the use and benefit of any British subject, contrary to the intent of this section, is void (a).

(a) The enactment reproduced by this section was passed in 1797 to stop the scandals caused by the lending of money by European adventurers to native princes on exorbitant terms. See above, p. 71. The expression 'British subject,' as used in the Act of 1797, would doubtless be construed in its narrower sense, as not including natives of India.

119.—(1) If any person holding office under the Crown in India commits any offence referred to in this Digest, or any other crime or offence, the offence may, without prejudice to any other jurisdiction, be inquired of, heard, tried, and determined before His Majesty's High Court of Justice, and be dealt with as if committed in the county of Middlesex.

Prosecution of offences in England. [10 Geo. III, c. 47, s. 4. 13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 39. 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7.]

(2) Every British subject is amenable to all courts of justice in Great Britain of competent jurisdiction to try offences committed in India for any offence committed within India and outside British India as if the offence had been committed within British India.

(3) Every prosecution in respect of any offence referred to in this section must be commenced within five years after the commission of the offence, or after the arrival in the United Kingdom of the person who committed the offence, whichever is later (a).

(a) This section is merely an imperfect attempt to reproduce several enactments of the eighteenth century which are still unrepealed, and which, though obsolete as respects procedure, may still be of importance with respect to jurisdiction. Section 67 of 33 Geo. III, c. 52, has been repealed as to Indian courts by Act XI of 1872, but is still unrepealed as to courts in the United Kingdom.

The limitation under 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7 (which applies only to proceedings against the governor-general or a member of his council), is five years after commission of offence or arrest in England. The limitation under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 141, is six years after commission of offence. There is a three years' limitation under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 162, which is repealed as to British India by Act IX of 1871. But all these limitations are now affected by the Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893 (56 & 57 Viet. c. 61).

The enactments reproduced run as follows :—

'If any person whatsoever employed by or in the service of the said united Company, in any civil or military station, office, or capacity whatsoever in the East Indies, or deriving or claiming any power, authority, or jurisdiction by or from the said united Company, shall, after the passing of this Act, be guilty of oppressing any of His Majesty's subjects beyond the seas within their respective jurisdictions, or in the exercise of any such station, office, employment, power, or authority derived or claimed by, from, or under the said united Company, or shall be guilty of any other crime or offence, such oppressions, crimes, and offences shall and may be inquired of, heard, and determined in His Majesty's Court of King's Bench in England; and such punishments shall be inflicted on such offenders as are usually inflicted for offences of the like nature committed in that part of Great Britain called England; and . . . the same and all other offences committed against this Act may be alleged to be committed, and may be laid, inquired of, and tried in the county of Middlesex' (10 Geo. III, c. 47, s. 4).

. . . 'If any governor-general, president, or governor or council of any of the said Company's principal or other settlements in India, or the chief justice, or any of the judges of the said Supreme Court of Judicature to be by the said new charter established, or of any other court in any of the said united Company's settlements, or any other person or persons who now are, or heretofore have been, employed by or in the service of the said united Company in any civil or military station, office, or capacity, or who have or claim, or heretofore have had or claimed, any power or authority or jurisdiction by or from the said united Company, or any of His Majesty's subjects residing in India, shall commit any offence against this Act, or shall have been or shall be guilty of any crime, misdemeanour, or offence committed against any of His Majesty's subjects, or any of the inhabitants of India, within their respective jurisdictions, all such crimes, offences, and misdemeanours may be respectively inquired of, heard, tried, and determined in His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, and all such persons so offending and not having been before tried for the same offence in India, shall on conviction, in any such case as is not otherwise specially provided for by this Act, be liable to such fine or corporal punishment as the said court shall think fit; and, moreover, shall be liable at the discretion of the said court, to be adjudged to be incapable of serving the said united Company in any office, civil or military; and all and every such crimes, offences, and misdemeanours as aforesaid may be alleged

Atlantic sea-board. Among these latter Portugal took the lead in developing the Indian trade, and when Pope Alexander VI (Roderic Borgia) issued his Bull of May, 1493, dividing the whole undiscovered non-Christian world between Spain and Portugal, it was to Portugal that he awarded India. But since 1580 Portugal had been subject to the Spanish Crown. Holland was at war with Spain, and was endeavouring to wrest from her the monopoly of Eastern trade which had come to her as sovereign of Portugal. During the closing years of the sixteenth century, associations of Dutch merchants had fitted out two great expeditions to Java by the Cape (1595-96, and 1598-99), and were shortly (1602) to be combined into the powerful Dutch East India Company. Protestant England was the political ally of Holland, but her commercial rival, and English merchants were not prepared to see the Indian trade pass wholly into her hands. It was in these circumstances that on September 24, 1599, the merchants of London held a meeting at Founder's Hall, under the Lord Mayor, and resolved to form an association for the purpose of establishing direct trade with India. But negotiations for peace were then in progress at Boulogne, and Queen Elizabeth was unwilling to take a step which would give umbrage to Spain. Hence she delayed for fifteen months to grant the charter for which the London merchants had petitioned. The charter incorporated George, Earl of Cumberland, and 215 knights, aldermen, and burgesses, by the name of the 'Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading with the East Indies.' The Company were to elect annually one governor and twenty-four committees, who were to have the direction of the Company's voyages, the provision of shipping and merchandises, the sale of merchandises returned, and the managing of all other things belonging to the Company. Thomas Smith, Alderman of London, and Governor of the Levant Company, was to be the first governor.

The Company might for fifteen years 'freely traffic and use

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
(January.) Treaty of Versailles.— Peace signed between England and United States.	1783-4. Fox's India Bill introduced and rejected.
1783 (December 23)—1801. William Pitt, Prime Minister.	1784. Treaty of peace with Tippu, Sultan of Mysore.—General peace in India.
1783. General peace in Europe.	Pitt's Act establishing Board of Control (24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25).
1786. Burke moves impeachment of Warren Hastings.	1785. Warren Hastings leaves India. Mahdajee Sindia (Maráthá) occu- pies Delhi.
1788-95. Trial of Warren Hastings.	1786. Act passed to enlarge powers of Governor-General (26 Geo. III, c. 16).
1789. Beginning of French Revolu- tion.	1786-93. Lord Cornwallis, Gover- nor-General.
1793. Execution of Louis XVI. War between England and France declared February 11.	1787. Tippu sends embassies to Paris and Constantinople.
1795. Cape of Good Hope captured from Dutch.	1789-90. Tippu attacks Travancore.
1797. Battle of Cape St. Vincent.— Mutiny at the Nore.	1790-2. War with Tippu.
1798. Irish Rebellion. French expedition to Egypt.— (August 1) Battle of the Nile.	1791. Bangalore taken.
1799. Buonaparte, First Consul.	1792. Tippu signs treaty of peace ceding territory.
1800. Union of Great Britain and Ireland.	1793. English take Pondicherry. Permanent settlement of Bengal. Cornwallis leaves India.
Battles of Marengo and Hohen- linden.	Act renewing Company's charter (33 Geo. III, c. 52).
Malta taken from French.	1793-8. Sir J. Shore (Lord Teign- mouth), Governor-General.
1801. Addington, Prime Minister.	1795. The Maráthás defeat the Nizám.
	1796. Ceylon taken from Dutch.
	1797. Shah Zeman invades Punjab.
	1798-1805. Marquis Wellesley, Governor-General.
	1799. Capture of Seringapatam. Death of Tippu. Partition of Mysore.
	1800. Subsidiary treaty with Nizám.
	1801. Incorporation of Carnatic. Oudh cedes territory by subsi- diary treaty.

to be committed, and may be laid, inquired of, and tried in the county of Middlesex ' (13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 39).

' No prosecution or suit shall be carried on against the said governor-general, or any member of the council, before any court in Great Britain (the High Court of Parliament only excepted), unless the same shall be commenced within five years after the offence committed, or within five years after his arrival in England ' (21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7).

' All His Majesty's subjects, as well servants of the said united Company as others, shall be and are hereby declared to be amenable to all courts of justice, both in India and Great Britain, of competent jurisdiction to try offences committed in India, for all acts, injuries, wrongs, oppressions, trespasses, misdemeanours, offences, and crimes whatever, by them or any of them done or to be done or committed in any of the lands or territories of any native prince or State, or against their persons or properties, or the persons or properties of any of their subjects or people, in the same manner as if the same had been done or committed within the territories directly subject to and under the British Government in India ' (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 67).

' All penalties, forfeitures, seizures, causes of seizure, crimes, misdemeanours, and other offences, which shall arise or be incurred or made under or shall be committed against this Act, shall be sued for, prosecuted, examined, recovered, and adjudged in any of His Majesty's Courts of Record at Westminster, or in the Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, or in one of the mayors' courts at Madras or Bombay respectively, in manner following ; that is to say, all such pecuniary penalties, and all forfeitures of ships, vessels, merchandise and goods, shall and may be sued for, condemned, and recovered by action, bill, suit, or information, wherein no essoin, protection, wager of law, or more than one imparlance, shall be granted or allowed ; and all such seizures, whether of any person or of any ships, vessels, merchandise and goods, and all causes of such seizures, shall be cognizable in such actions, suits, or prosecutions as shall bring into question or relate to the lawfulness or regularity of any such seizure ; and all such offences as by this Act are not made punishable by pecuniary penalties or by any forfeiture of goods, but by fine or imprisonment, or both, or are hereby created, without providing any particular punishment, shall be prosecuted by indictment or information as misdemeanours, for breach thereof, and shall be punished by fine or imprisonment, or both, at the discretion of the court in which such prosecution shall, by virtue of this Act, be begun and carried on ; and if such prosecution for a misdemeanour shall be in any of the said courts in the East Indies, and the person or persons prosecuted shall be there convicted, it shall be lawful for such court to order, as part or for the whole of the punishment, any such person or persons to be sent and conveyed to Great Britain ' (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 140).

' Whenever any action, bill, suit, information, or indictment shall be brought or prosecuted in any of His Majesty's Courts of Record at Westminster, for any offence against this Act, whether for a penalty,

forfeiture, or misdemeanour, the offence shall be laid or alleged to have been committed in the city of London or county of Middlesex, at the option of the informer or prosecutor; and all actions, bills, suits, informations, and indietments for any offence or offences against this Act, whether filed, brought, commenced or prosecuted for a penalty or forfeiture, or for a misdemeanour, in any of His Majesty's Courts of Record at Westminster, or in the said Supreme Court, or any such mayor's court as aforesaid, shall be brought and prosecuted within six years next after the offence shall be committed, and a capias shall issue in the first process, and in the case of an offence hereby made punishable by any penalty or forfeiture, such capias shall specify the sum of the penalty or forfeiture sued for; and the person or persons sued or prosecuted for such penalty shall, on such capias, give to the person or persons to whom such capias shall be directed, sufficient bail or security, by natural-born subjects or denizens, for appearing in the court out of which such capias shall issue, at the day or return of such writ, to answer such suit or prosecution, and shall likewise, at the time of such appearance, give sufficient bail or security, by such persons as aforesaid, in the same court, to answer and pay all the forfeitures and penalties sued for, if he, she, or they shall be convicted of such offence or offences, or to yield his, her, or their body or bodies to prison; but if the prosecution shall be for any offence or offences against this Act punishable only as a misdemeanour, then the person or persons against whom such capias shall issue, being thereupon arrested, shall be imprisoned and bailable according to law as in other cases of misdemeanour' (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 141).

'All suits and prosecutions for anything done under or by virtue of this Act shall be commenced within the space of three years after the cause of complaint shall have arisen, or, being done in Great Britain, in the absence of any person beyond sea aggrieved thereby, then within the space of three years next after the return of such person to Great Britain' (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 162).

Provision
as to per-
sons sus-
pected of
dangerous
correspon-
dence.

[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
ss. 45, 46.]

120.—(1) The Governor-General in Council and the Governors in Council of Madras and Bombay respectively may issue warrants for securing and detaining in custody any person suspected of carrying on mediately or immediately any illicit correspondence dangerous to the peace or safety of any part of British India with any prince, rajah, zemindar, or other person having authority in India, or with the commander, governor, or president of any factory or settlement established in India by a European power, or any correspondence contrary to the rules and orders of the Secretary of State or of the Governor-General in Council or Governor in Council.

(2) If on examination taken on oath in writing of any credible witness before the Governor-General in Council or the Governor in Council there appear reasonable grounds for the charge, the governor-general or governor may commit the persons suspected or accused to safe custody, and must within a reasonable time, not exceeding five days, cause to be delivered to him a copy of the charge or accusation on which he is committed.

(3) The person charged may deliver his defence in writing, with a list of such witnesses as he may desire to be examined in support thereof.

(4) The witnesses in support of the charge and of the defence must be examined and cross-examined on oath in the presence of the person accused, and their depositions and examination must be taken down in writing.

(5) If, notwithstanding the defence, there appear to the Governor-General in Council or Governor in Council reasonable grounds for the charge or accusation and for continuing the confinement, the person accused is to remain in custody until he is brought to trial in India or sent to England for that purpose.

(6) All such examinations and proceedings or attested copies thereof under the seal of the high court must be sent to the Secretary of State as soon as may be in order to their being produced in evidence on the trial of the person accused in the event of his being sent for trial to England.

(7) If any such person is to be sent to England the governor-general or governor, as the case may be, must cause him to be sent to England at the first convenient opportunity, unless he is disabled by illness from undertaking the voyage, in which case he must be so sent as soon as his state of health will safely admit thereof.

(8) The examinations and proceedings transmitted in pursuance of this section are to be deemed and received as evidence in all courts of law, subject to any just exceptions as to the competency of the witnesses (a).

(a) The provisions of the Act of 1793, reproduced by this section, have never been repealed. But no record has been found of any case in which they have been put into operation, and the cases which they were mainly designed to meet could probably be dealt with under other enactments. Powers of arrest and imprisonment for political offences are given by Bengal Regulation III of 1818, Madras Regulation II of 1819, Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827, Act XXXIV of 1850 (the State Prisoners Act, 1850), and Act III of 1858 (the State Prisoners Act, 1858). See *In the matter of Amcer Khan*, 6 Bengal Law Rep. 392. The Bombay Regulation was used in 1886 for the arrest of Dhuleep Singh at Aden, and has since (in 1897) been put in force in connexion with seditious proceedings at Poona.

PART XII.

SUPPLEMENTAL.

Savings.

Saving as
to certain
rights and
powers.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s.
51.
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 52.]

121.—(1) Nothing in this Digest derogates from or interferes with the rights vested in His Majesty, or the powers vested in the Secretary of State in Council, in relation to the Government of British India, by any law in force at the passing of the Government of India Act, 1850.

(2) Nothing in this Digest affects the power of Parliament to control the proceedings of the Governor-General in Council or of any local Government, or to repeal or alter any law or regulation made by any authority in British India, or to legislate for British India and the inhabitants thereof (a).

(a) These savings, reproduced from the Acts of 1833 and 1861, are important as showing that the parliamentary enactments relating to India were never intended to be and cannot be construed as a complete code of the powers and rights exercisable by or with reference to the Government of India.

Treaties,
contracts,
and lia-
bilities of
East India
Company.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 67.]

122.—(1) All treaties made by the East India Company are, so far as they are in force, binding on His Majesty (a).

(2) All contracts made and liabilities incurred by the East India Company may, so far as they are still outstanding, be enforced by and against the Secretary of State in Council.

(a) A treaty, unless confirmed by legislation, cannot affect private rights of British subjects in times of peace. *Walker v. Baird*, [1892] A. C. 492, 496.

123. All orders, regulations, and directions lawfully made or given by the Court of Directors of the East India Company, or by the Commissioners for the Affairs of India, are, so far as they are in force, to be deemed to be orders, regulations, and directions made by the Secretary of State under the Government of India Act, 1858.

Orders of
East India
Company.
[21 & 22
Vict. c.
106, s. 59.]

Definitions.

124. In this Digest the following expressions, unless the contrary intention appears, have the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them ; namely,—

Defini-
tions.

- (1) The expression 'British India' means all territories and places within His Majesty's dominions which are for the time being governed by His Majesty through the Governor-General of India or through any governor or other officer subordinate to the Governor-General of India (a).
- (2) The expression 'India' means British India together with any territories of any native prince or chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty exercised through the Governor-General of India, or through any governor or other officer subordinate to the Governor-General of India (a).
- (3) The expression 'province' means any part of British India the executive government of which is administered by a Governor in Council, governor, lieutenant-governor, or chief commissioner (b).
- (4) The expression 'local Government' means a Governor in Council, lieutenant-governor, or chief commissioner (c).
- (5) The expression 'high court' means a court established for some part of British India by His Majesty's letters patent (d).
- (6) The expression 'Civil Service of India' means the service so designated in the rules now in force.
- (7) The expression 'office' includes place and employment.

52 & 53
 Vict. c. 63.

The Interpretation Act, 1889, applies to the construction of this Digest (c).

(a) The definitions of 'British India' and 'India' follow those adopted in the Interpretation Act, 1889 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 18), and in the Indian General Clauses Act, 1897 (X of 1897, s. 3 (7), (27)).

British India corresponds to the territories which were in the Act of 1858 described as 'the territories in the possession of or under the government of the East India Company,' and which were then held by the Company in trust for the Crown.

Aden is part of British India, and is included in the Bombay presidency. See the Aden Laws Regulation, 1891 (II of 1891).

India, as distinguished from British India, includes also the territories of Native States, which used to be described in Acts of Parliament as 'the dominions of the princes and States of India in alliance with Her Majesty,' or in similar terms. See, e.g. 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22; 28 & 29 Vict. c. 15, s. 3; 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 1; 53 & 54 Vict. c. 37, s. 15.

The expression 'suzerainty' is substituted by the Interpretation Act for the older expression 'alliance,' as indicating more accurately the relation between the rulers of these States and the British Crown as the paramount authority throughout India. It is a term which is perhaps incapable of precise definition, but which is usefully employed to indicate the political authority exercised by one State over another, and approximating more or less closely to complete sovereignty. See Holland's *Jurisprudence*, ed. 7, pp. 45, 347, and below, Chapter v.

The territories of the Native States are not part of the dominions of the King, but their subjects are, for international purposes, in the same position as British subjects. For instance, under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 37, s. 15), where an order made in pursuance of the Act extends to persons enjoying His Majesty's protection, that expression is to be construed as including all subjects of the several princes and States in India. And it is possible that a subject of a Native State would not be held to be an 'alien' within the meaning of the Naturalization Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 14), so as to be capable of obtaining a certificate of naturalization under that Act.

The expression 'prince or chief' seems wide enough to include the ruler or head-man, by whatever name called, of any petty tribe or clan or group, however rudimentary may be its political organization. But of course political authority may be so widely distributed among head-men or elders, or members of the tribe or group, as to make the task of finding an individual or collective 'sovereign' very difficult. This difficulty is to some extent met by s. 2 of the Imperial Foreign Jurisdiction Act (53 & 54 Vict. c. 37).

It has sometimes been found difficult to determine whether a particular territory ought to be treated as part of British India, or of India in the wider sense, and questions have arisen as to the status of such

territories as Kathiawar, Cooch Behar, and the tributary mahals of Orissa. See *Empress v. Keshub Mahajun*, (1882) I. L. R. 8 Cal. 985, and *Re Bichitramund*, (1889) I. L. R. 16 Cal. 667. The position of Kathiawar was carefully considered in two cases which came together in 1905 before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, *Hemchand Derchand v. Azam Sakarlal Chhotamlal* and *The Taluka of Kotda Sangani v. The State of Gondal*. A. C. [1906] 212. Both these cases were, in effect, appeals from decisions of British political agents exercising jurisdiction in Kathiawar. It was decided (1) that Kathiawar is not as a whole within the King's dominions; (2) that the right of appeal to the King in Council from British courts exercising jurisdiction outside British dominions is not limited to British subjects; (3) that the question whether an appeal lies to the King in Council from the decision of a British political agent in Kathiawar depends on whether the jurisdiction exercised is political or judicial in its character. In the two cases in question the jurisdiction was held to be political, and the appeals were dismissed.

India in the wider sense would not include French or Portuguese territory.

The expression 'British India,' as defined above, includes the land down to low-water mark, and would ordinarily include the territorial waters of British India, though not the high seas beyond (*R. v. Edmonstone*, (1879) 7 Bom. Cr. Ca. 109). In 1871 the Bombay High Court held that the provisions of the Indian Penal Code applied to offences committed within a marine league of the shore of British India (*R. v. Kastya Rama*, 8 Bom. Cr. Ca. 63). But this decision is now affected by the Territorial Waters Jurisdiction Act, 1878 (41 & 42 Vict. c. 73), as to which see the note on s. 101.

For fiscal and protective purposes the Indian Legislature has made laws for Indian waters. See, e.g. the Transport of Salt Act, 1879 (XVI of 1879), and the Obstructions in Fairways Act, 1881 (XVI of 1881).

The settlements of Prince of Wales' Island, Singapore, and Malacca were, in pursuance of the Straits Settlements Act, 1866 (29 & 30 Vict. c. 115, s. 1), removed from British India and placed under the Colonial Office.

(b) 'Province' is defined in the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (43)) as meaning the territories for the time being administered by any local Government.

(c) 'Local Government' is defined in the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (29)) as meaning 'the person authorized by law to administer executive government in the part of British India in which the Act or regulation containing the expression operates,' and as including a chief commissioner.

There are at present thirteen local Governments in British India, namely, the Governor of Madras in Council; the Governor of Bombay in Council; the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal; the Lieutenant-Governor of the United provinces of Agra and Oudh; the Lieutenant-Governor of

the Punjab; the Lieutenant-Governor of Burma; the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam; the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces; the Chief Commissioner of British Baluchistan; the Chief Commissioner of Ajmere; the Chief Commissioner of Coorg; the Chief Commissioner of the North-West Frontier Province; and the Chief Commissioner of the Andaman Islands. Under Act V of 1868 the powers of a local Government for certain purposes may be delegated to the commissioner in Sindh.

(d) This definition only includes the chartered high courts at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Allahabad. The definition in the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (24)) is wider, and includes the various judicial commissioners and the chief court of the Punjab.

(e) In a Digest of this kind it seems convenient to adopt the same general rules of construction as are applied to recent Acts of Parliament. The application of the Interpretation Act makes the definitions of 'British India' and 'India,' strictly speaking, superfluous, but they are set out on account of their importance.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES.

1. *Omissions from Digest.*

The following enactments have not been reproduced in this Digest, on the ground of either never having come into operation, or having ceased through change of circumstances to be in operation:—

The power given by 13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 9, for the Governor-General in Council to suspend the Government of Madras or Bombay in case of disobedience.

The express grant by 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 17, of jurisdiction over all inhabitants of Calcutta.

The saving in 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 18, for the rights of fathers of Hindu and Mahomedan families and rules of caste.

The procedure under 24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25, ss. 66 and 77, for constituting a special court for the trial of Indian offenders. This machinery has never been put into force.

The provisions in 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 41, as to the duty of local Governments in the case of conflict between the orders of the Governor-General in Council and the orders of the Directors of the East India Company.

The provision in 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 70, as to forfeiture of office after absence for five years.

The requirement in 37 Geo. III, c. 142, to send to the Board for Affairs of India the forms and rules made in India as to process in the recorders' courts.

The enactments in 53 Geo. III, c. 155, ss. 42, 43, as to the control of the India Board over colleges and seminaries in India, and as to the provision to be made for public education in India.

The provision in 53 Geo. III, c. 155, ss. 85, 86, as to the precedence of civil servants.

The provisions in 6 Geo. IV, c. 85, s. 5, as to the payments to be made in the case of judges and bishops.

The provision in 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, for dividing the Presidency of Fort William into two presidencies.

The provision in section 56 of the same Act for the government of Bengal by a Governor in Council.

The express power given by section 86 of the same Act to hold land in India.

2. Powers of Governor-General to grant Military Commissions.

Questions have sometimes been raised as to the power of the governor-general, either alone or in council, to grant military commissions, with command over officers and men of the regular forces, and as to the effect of commissions so granted, and as the answer to the question depends on a series of enactments and other documents, it seems worth while to state it somewhat fully.

Before the passing of the Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106), the Governor-General in Council granted commissions to officers of the troops of the East India Company.

The power to grant such commissions may be presumed to have been derived from the charters and Acts relating to the East India Company.

According to Sir George Chesney (*Indian Polity*, 3rd edition, ch. xii), the first establishment of the Company's Indian army may be considered to date from 1748, when a small body of sepoys was raised at Madras, after the example set by the French, for the defence of that settlement, during the course of the war which had broken out four years previously between France and England. At the same time a European force was raised, formed of such sailors as could be spared from the ships on the coast, and of men smuggled on board the Company's vessels in England by the crimps. An officer (Major Lawrence) was appointed by a commission from the Company to command their forces in India.

In 1754 an Act (27 Geo. II, c. 9) was passed for punishing mutiny and desertion of officers and men in the service of the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies, and for the punishment of offences committed in the East Indies, and at the island of St. Helena. This Act recites that for the safety and protection of their settlements, and for the better carrying on of their trade, the East India Company, at their own costs and charges, do maintain and keep a military force for the garrison and defence of their settlements, factories, and places, and that it is requisite for the retaining of such forces in their duty that an exact discipline be observed, and that soldiers who shall mutiny or stir up sedition, or shall desert the Company's service, shall be brought to a more exemplary and speedy punishment than the

usual forms of law allow. The Act then proceeds to make officers and soldiers of the Company's forces subject to punishment by court-martial for military offences, and authorizes the grant of a commission or warrant under the King's Royal Sign Manual, by virtue of which the Court of Directors of the Company may authorize their president and council to appoint courts-martial.

The Act does not, in so many words, give the Company power to grant commissions; and Brougham, in the course of his argument in the case of *Bradley v. Arthur* (2 State Trials, N.S. p. 190), comments on the avoidance of the word 'commission' in the statute. The expression used is 'that if any person *being mustered or in pay as an officer*, or who is or shall be enlisted, or in the Company's pay as a soldier,' does so and so, he is to be tried by court-martial.

The statement that the word 'commission' does not appear in the statute is not strictly accurate, for it is used in section 5; but there is nothing to show that the commissions there referred to are commissions in the army of the East India Company.

Nor does Brougham appear to have been accurate in saying that the Act was a temporary Act annually renewed. It appears to have been a permanent Act, but ceased to have any operation after the abolition of the East India Company's army, and was formally repealed by the Statute Law Revision Act of 1867.

There appear to have been always doubts as to the exact status conferred by military commissions in the Company's army. In 1796 Lord Cornwallis was appointed commander-in-chief as well as Governor-General of India, and was thus invested with the supreme military as well as the supreme authority. One of the objects with which this combination of powers was conferred on him was to enable him to remove or mitigate the jealousies and friction between the King's officers and the Company's officers, and with this object he granted, in 1788 or 1789, brevet commissions in the royal service to all the Company's officers, with dates corresponding to their substantive commissions (*Cornwallis Correspondence*, 2nd edition, vol. ii. p. 428; Chesney, *Indian Polity*, ch. xii). This arrangement, according to Sir G. Chesney, was continued until the abolition of the Company's government in 1858, brevet commissions being granted under powers delegated for that purpose by the Crown to the Commander-in-Chief in India. Without such brevet commission it is at least doubtful whether officers of the Company's forces could have exercised any command over officers or soldiers of the regular forces.

By the Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106), the government of India was transferred to the Crown. But by s. 30 of that Act it was provided that all appointments to offices, commands, and employments in India, and all promotions which by law or under regulations, usage, or custom were then made by any authority in India, should continue to be made in India by the like authority and subject to the qualifications, conditions, and restrictions then affecting such appointments respectively.

the trade of merchandise by sea in and by such ways and passages already found out or which hereafter shall be found out and discovered . . . into and from the East Indies, in the countries and parts of Asia and Africa, and into and from all the islands, ports, havens, cities, creeks, towns, and places of Asia and Africa, and America, or any of them, beyond the Cape of Bona Esperanza to the Streights of Magellan.'

During these fifteen years the Company might assemble themselves in any convenient place, 'within our dominions or elsewhere,' and there 'hold court' for the Company and the affairs thereof, and, being so assembled, might 'make, ordain, and constitute such and so many reasonable laws, constitutions, orders, and ordinances, as to them or the greater part of them being then and there present, shall seem necessary and convenient for the good government of the same Company, and of all factors, masters, mariners, and other officers, employed or to be employed in any of their voyages, and for the better advancement and continuance of the said trade and traffick.' They might also impose such pains, punishments, and penalties by imprisonment of body, or by fines and amerciaments, as might seem necessary or convenient for observation of these laws and ordinances. But their laws and punishments were to be reasonable, and not contrary or repugnant to the laws, statutes, or customs of the English realm.

The charter was to last for fifteen years, subject to a power of determination on two years' warning, if the trade did not appear to be profitable to the realm. If otherwise, it might be renewed for a further term of fifteen years.

The Company's right of trading, during the term and within the limits of the charter, was to be exclusive, but they might grant licences to trade. Unauthorized traders were to be liable to forfeiture of their goods, ships, and tackle, and to 'imprisonment and such other punishment as to us, our heirs and successors, for so high a contempt, shall seem meet and convenient.'

The Act 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100 (1860), after reciting that 'it is not expedient that a separate European force should be continued for the local service of Her Majesty in India,' enacted that 'so much of the Act of Parliament of the twenty-second and twenty-third of Her Majesty, chapter twenty-seven, intituled 'An Act to repeal the thirty-first section of sixteen and seventeen Victoria, chapter ninety-five, and to alter the limit of the number of European troops to be maintained for local service in India,' and of any former Act or Acts of Parliament as renders it lawful for the Secretary of State in Council from time to time to give such directions as he may think fit for raising such number of European forces as he may judge necessary for the Indian Army of Her Majesty, is hereby repealed.' This Act received the Royal Assent on August 20, 1860.

Sir Charles Wood, when Secretary of State for India, by his Dispatch, No. 461, dated December 16, 1862, informed the governor-general that local commissions should in all practicable cases be bestowed by the field-marshal commanding-in-chief on the recommendation of the Government of India preferred through the Secretary of State, but that in any case commissions which the Government of India might consider it necessary to bestow without previous reference should be subject to the confirmation of the Crown applied for through the same channel.

Sir Charles Wood, by his Dispatch, No. 351, dated November 16, 1864, informed the Government of India that, in view of royal commissions being granted to all officers of Her Majesty's Indian forces and staff corps, the issue of commissions either by local Governments or by the commander-in-chief was unnecessary.

The Indian Volunteers Act, 1869 (XX of 1869), which is amended by Act X of 1896, provides for the formation and dissolution and for the good order and discipline of volunteer corps in India. The Act is silent as to the grant of commissions to volunteer officers, but provides (s. 14) that the commissions are to cease on retirement or dismissal. In practice, however, commissions to officers of volunteers under this Act are signed either by the governor-general or by the Governor-General in Council. Members of a corps of volunteers under the Indian Act are, on being called out for duty, subject, by virtue of s. 8 of that Act, to military law under the Army Act, and by virtue of s. 177 of the Army Act would be so subject, whether within or without the limits of India.

The regular forces are under the command of the Crown, and the military rank and military powers of command of officers of the regular forces depend solely on commissions from the Crown, issued in accordance with the provisions of 25 & 26 Vict. c. 4.

The commission of a commander-in-chief usually authorizes him to grant commissions until the pleasure of the Crown is signified, and sometimes gives him absolute powers to grant commissions. Commissions so granted are granted by a military and not by a civil authority, and by virtue of express authority from the King. The commander-

in-chief in India is not at present authorized by his commission to sign commissions on behalf of the King.

Before 1871 commissions to officers of the auxiliary forces in the United Kingdom were granted by the lieutenants of counties in England and Scotland and by the Lord Lieutenant in Ireland. The power to grant these commissions was given by statute, and the rank and powers of command of the commissioned officers were also regulated by statute (see, e.g. 26 & 27 Vict. c. 65, s. 5). Without such a statutory provision they would have had no command over the regular forces. But by s. 6 of the Regulation of the Forces Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 86), it was enacted that all officers in the militia, yeomanry, and volunteers of England, Scotland, and Ireland should hold commissions from Her Majesty, to be prepared, authenticated, and issued in the manner in which commissions of officers in Her Majesty's land forces are prepared, authenticated, and issued according to any law or custom for the time being in force. Accordingly all such commissions are now granted directly or indirectly by the Crown.

The power of granting military commissions may be delegated by the Crown, but the power must apparently be given in express terms (see *Bradley v. Arthur*, 2 State Trials, N.S. 171), and it has been considered doubtful whether it could be given to a civilian (see Clode, *Military Forces of the Crown*, vol. ii. p. 72, and *Bradley v. Arthur*, 2 State Trials, N.S. 183, 196, 202-203). Certainly in India, down to 1850, all commissions giving command over the regular forces were given by the military authority—the commander-in-chief, and not the governor-general. However, Sir Bartle Frere, when High Commissioner for South Africa, was empowered by letters patent (dated October 10, 1878) to appoint any officer of the regular troops serving in South Africa to local and temporary rank and command therein, and by subsequent letters patent (dated March 22, 1879) to appoint any officer of the local forces serving in South Africa to local and temporary rank and command in the regular army. But this was a special appointment in time of war, and outside the colonial limits. 'Local forces' may have meant forces within ss. 175 (4) and 176 (3) of the Army Act, or colonial forces within s. 177 of the Army Act, or both. As to the powers ordinarily exercisable by colonial governors in military matters, see Todd, *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies* (second edition), p. 41.

The existing Army Act (44 & 45 Vict. c. 58) does not confer on the Governor-General of India any power to grant commissions or recognize any such power. Indeed, the Act treats him throughout as a civil and not a military officer (see, e.g. ss. 54, 62, 65, 94, 130, 134, 169). If his commission were to confer on him the powers of a commander-in-chief, he might, no doubt, by virtue of those powers, grant military commissions such as were granted by Lord Cornwallis in his capacity of commander-in-chief; but otherwise he would appear not to have, by virtue of his office, power to grant any military command over officers of the regular forces.

In 1866 a provision was inserted in s. 52 of the Mutiny Act to the

effect that, notwithstanding anything in the Act 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100, any person authorized in that behalf in India might enlist and attest, within the local limits of his authority, any person desirous of enlisting in Her Majesty's Indian forces. This provision was re-enacted by s. 52 of each successive annual Mutiny Act, and was eventually reproduced by s. 180 (1) (b) of the existing Army Act, which provides that persons may be enlisted and attested in India for medical service or for other special service in Her Majesty's Indian forces for such periods, by such persons, and in such manner as may be from time to time authorized by the Governor-General of India. Enlistment is the process for taking men, not officers, into the army, and the section says nothing about the grant of commissions.

Section 71 of the Army Act enacts that 'for the purpose of removing doubts as to the powers of command vested or to be vested in officers and others belonging to Her Majesty's forces, it is hereby declared that Her Majesty may, in such manner as to Her Majesty may from time to time seem meet, make regulations as to the persons to be invested as officers, or otherwise, with command over Her Majesty's forces, or any part thereof, and as to the mode in which such command is to be exercised; provided that command shall not be given to any person over a person superior in rank to himself.' This provision was first enacted in 1881, when the old enactments as to the rank and command of officers of the military and other auxiliary forces were repealed, and its object was to provide for officers of the regular forces exercising command over officers of the auxiliary forces, and vice versa.

Under these circumstances it would appear that any forms of appointment, whether described as commissions or otherwise, granted by the governor-general or by the Governor-General in Council, could not confer the status and powers of command conferred by commissions under the signature of the King. No express power to grant such commissions is conferred on the governor-general by the existing form of his warrant of appointment.

SCHEDULES

FIRST SCHEDULE.

OFFICIAL SALARIES¹.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Officer.</i>	<i>Maximum Salary.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76.	Viceroy and Governor-General.	2,40,000 Sica Rs. = Rs. 2,50,000.
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76.	Governors of Madras and Bombay.	1,20,000 Sica Rs. = Rs. 1,28,000.
16 & 17 Viet. c. 95, s. 35.	Commander-in-Chief.	Rs. 1,00,000.
16 & 17 Viet. c. 95, s. 35.	Lieutenant-Governor.	Rs. 1,00,000.
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76.	Members of Governor-General's Council.	90,000 Sica Rs. = Rs. 1,02,400.
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76.	Member of Council, Madras and Bombay.	60,000 Sica Rs. = Rs. 64,000.

SECOND SCHEDULE.

OFFICES RESERVED TO THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA.

Secretaries, junior secretaries, and under secretaries to the several Governments in India, except the secretaries, junior secretaries, and under secretaries in the Military, Marine, and Public Works Departments.

Accountant-general.

Civil auditor.

Sub-treasurer.

Judicial.

1. Civil and sessions judges, or chief judicial officers of districts in the provinces known as Regulation Provinces.

2. Additional and assistant judges in the said provinces.

3. Magistrates or chief magisterial officers of districts in the said provinces.

¹ See s. 80 of Digest.

4. Joint magistrates in the said provinces.
5. Assistant magistrates, or assistants to magistrates in the said provinces.

Revenue.

1. Members of the Board of Revenue in the presidencies of Bengal and Madras.
2. Secretaries to the said Boards of Revenue.
3. Commissioners of revenue, or chief revenue officers of divisions, in the provinces known as Regulation Provinces.
4. Collectors of revenue, or chief revenue officers of districts, in the said provinces.
5. Deputy or subordinate collectors where combined with the office of joint magistrate in the said provinces.
6. Assistant collectors or assistants to collectors in the said provinces.
7. Salt agents.
8. Controller of salt chowkies.
9. Commissioners of customs, salt, and opium.
10. Opium agents¹.

¹ See s. 93 of Digest. This is the schedule appended to the Act of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 54), but it has now become in some respects obsolete. For instance, the expression 'Regulation Provinces' is only intelligible by reference to a past state of things. It means practically the presidencies of Madras and Bombay, and the lieutenant-governorships of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces.

TABLE OF COMPARISON BETWEEN STATUTORY ENACTMENTS AND DIGEST

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
10 Geo. III, c. 47, s. 2.	The East India Company Act, 1770. Persons in service of Company transporting warlike stores.	Not reproduced. Appears to be virtually repealed by 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 146.
s. 3.	Balloting by Court of Directors of East India Company.	Not reproduced. Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act ¹ , 1887.
s. 4.	Trial in England of Company's servants committing offences in India.	Extended by 13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 39, to all offenders. Reproduced by ss. 117 (1), 119.
s. 5.	In action against East India Company, defendant may plead the general issue.	Not reproduced. Repealed as to U. K. by 56 & 57 Vict. c. 61 (Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893).
s. 6.	The Act to be a public Act.	Not reproduced. Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 7.	In action against East India Company in England, defendant to give notice of substance of defence.	Not reproduced. Repealed as to U. K. by 56 & 57 Vict. c. 61.
13 Geo. III, c. 63.	The East India Company Act, 1772.	
Preamble.	Not reproduced. Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 1.	Number of directors of East India Company.	
s. 2.	

¹ S. L. R. Act = Statute Law Revision Act. Acts under this name are periodically passed for the purpose of removing from the Statute Book enactments which have been virtually repealed or have otherwise ceased to be in force as law.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 3-5.	Qualification for votes of proprietors of East India Company for election of directors, &c.	Not reproduced. Repealed as to U.K. by S.L.R. Act, 1887.
s. 6.	Oath to be taken by proprietors of East India Company on election of directors, &c.	
s. 7.	Government of Bengal vested in governor-general and four councillors.	Not reproduced. superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 39.
s. 8.	Difference of opinion in governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 44 (1).
s. 9.	President and Council of Madras, Bombay, and Ben- coolen— not to make war or treaty without orders of Governor-General in Council or East India Company. liable to suspension if they disobey.	Repealed in part, S.L.R. Act, 1892. Reproduced by s. 49 (2). Ben- coolen has been given to the Dutch. Modified by 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 43. The power for the Governor-General in Council to suspend a local Government in case of disobedience has been omitted as having been made unnecessary by change of circumstances.
	to obey orders of Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by s. 49 (1).
	to keep Governor-General in Council informed of their proceedings.	Repealed by S.L.R. Act, 1892.
	Governor-General in Council —to obey orders of East India Company.	Reproduced by s. 36 (2).
	to correspond with East India Company.	Reproduced by s. 17.
	Court of Directors to send to Treasury copies of correspondence relating to revenues.	Repealed by S. R. L. Act, 1892.
s. 10.	Appointment of first Governor-General and members of his Council.	Not reproduced. Spent. Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 10 (continued).	Appointment and removal of second Governor-General and members of his Council.	Not reproduced. Spent. Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 11.	Provisions of section 10, when to take effect.	Spent. Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 12.	Saving of power to make appointments.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 13, 14.	Constitution, powers, and jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Calcutta.	Reproduced by s. 101. The supreme courts were abolished, and their powers and jurisdiction vested in the high courts, by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, ss. 8, 9. S. 101 saves these powers and this jurisdiction.
s. 15.	Offences by Governor-General and members of his Council not triable by Supreme Court, Calcutta.	Reproduced by s. 105 (c).
s. 16.	Jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Calcutta, as to contracts.	Repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870, and S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 17.	Governor-General, members of his Council, and judges of Supreme Court not to be arrested or imprisoned by that Court.	Reproduced by s. 105 (1) (b), and (2).
s. 18.	Appeal to King in Council.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 19.	Charter of mayor's court, Calcutta.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 20-22.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 23.	Governor-General, his Council, and judges of Supreme Court, Calcutta, not to receive gifts.	{ Reproduced by s. 117 (5). The words as to a promise of a gift are omitted. S. 117 (5), following 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76, is limited to the acceptance of gifts by an official in the discharge of his office.
s. 24.	No official to receive gift from native.	

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 25.	Exception as to fees of barristers, &c.	Reproduced by s. 117 (5).
ss. 26-29.	Repealed, 24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25, s. 47, and 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 146.
ss. 30, 31.	Repealed as to U.K. by S.L.R. Act, 1887.
s. 32.	Repealed, 24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25, s. 47, and 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 146.
s. 33.	Power of Indian courts to punish East India Company's servants for breach of trust, &c.	Not reproduced. Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870.
ss. 34, 35.	Repealed as to U.K. by S.L.R. Act, 1887.
s. 36.	Power of Governor-General in Council to make laws.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 37.	Power of Crown to disallow such laws.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 21.
s. 38.	Governor-General, members of his Council, and judges of Supreme Court to be justices of the peace.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 39.	Trial of offences in England.	Reproduced by s. 119.
ss. 40, 41.	Procedure for obtaining evidence in India for criminal proceedings in the high court in England.	Left outstanding as belonging to the law of evidence.
s. 42.	Procedure for obtaining evidence in India for proceedings in Parliament against Indian offenders.	
s. 43.	Proceedings in Parliament against Indian offenders not to be discontinued by prorogation or dissolution of Parliament.	

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 44.	Procedure for obtaining evidence in India for civil proceedings in the high court in England.	} Left outstanding as belonging to the law of evidence.
s. 45.	Depositions in capital cases not allowed as evidence, except in proceedings in Parliament.	
s. 46.	Saving for privileges of East India Company.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 47.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
	The East India Company Act, 1780.	
21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 1.	Governor-General and his Council exempt from jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Calcutta, for official acts.	Reproduced by s. 105 (a).
ss. 2-4.	Written order by Governor-General in Council a justification for any act in any court in India.	Reproduced by s. 106.
s. 5.	Procedure in case of oppression, &c., by Governor-General or his Council.	Reproduced by s. 107 (1) and (2).
s. 6.	Copies and depositions admissible in evidence.	Reproduced by s. 107 (3).
s. 7.	Limitation of prosecutions and suits against Governor-General and his Council.	Reproduced by s. 119 (3). The provision as to limitation of civil suits, and the exception as to Parliament, have not been expressly reproduced.
s. 8.	Supreme Court not to have jurisdiction in matters concerning the revenue.	Reproduced by s. 101 (3).
ss. 9, 10.	Exemption of certain classes of persons from jurisdiction of Supreme Court.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.

The Company might admit into their body all such apprentices of any member of the Company, and all such servants or factors of the Company, 'and all such other' as to the majority present at a court might be thought fit. If any member, having promised to contribute towards an adventure of the Company, failed to pay his contribution, he might be removed, disenfranchised, and displaced.

Points of constitutional interest in charter of Elizabeth. Constitution of Company. The points of constitutional interest in the charter of Elizabeth are the constitution of the Company, its privileges, and its legislative powers. The twenty-four committees to whom, with the governor, is entrusted the direction of the Company's business, are individuals, not bodies, and are the predecessors of the later directors. Their assembly is in subsequent charters called the court of committees, as distinguished from the court general or general court, which answers to the 'general meeting' of modern companies.

The most noticeable difference between the charter and modern instruments of association of a similar character is the absence of any reference to the capital of the Company and the corresponding qualification and voting powers of members. It appears from the charter that the adventurers had undertaken to contribute towards the first voyage certain sums of money, which were 'set down and written in a book for that purpose,' and failure to pay their contributions to the treasurer within a specified date was to involve 'removal and disenfranchisement' of the defaulters. But the charter does not specify the amount of the several contributions¹, and for all that appears to the contrary each adventurer was to be equally eligible to the office of committee, and to have equal voting power in the general court. The explanation is that the Company belonged at the outset to the simpler and looser form of association to which the City Companies then belonged, and still belong, and which used to be known by the name of

¹ The total amount subscribed in September, 1599, was £30,133, and there were 101 subscribers.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
21 Geo. III, c. 70, ss. 11-16.	Registration of native servants of East India Company.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 17.	Jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Calcutta. Proviso as to native laws and usages.	Not reproduced. Saved by s. 101 (1). This section is reproduced by s. 108 so far as it appears to represent existing law. The express grant of jurisdiction over all inhabitants of Calcutta is omitted as no longer necessary.
s. 18.	Rights of fathers of Hindu and Mahomedan families, and rules of caste, preserved.	Omitted as unnecessary. May be, and has been to some extent, modified or superseded by Indian legislation.
ss. 19, 20.	Power for Supreme Court, Calcutta, to make rules as to process.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 21, 22.	Judicial powers of Governor-General in Council.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 23.	Power of Governor-General in Council to frame regulations for provincial courts and councils.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 24.	No action for acts done by, or by order of, judicial officers.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 25, 26.	Notice to judicial officer before prosecuting him.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 27, 28.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1872.
24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25, ss. 1-63.	The East India Company Act, 1784.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1872
ss. 64, 65.	Procedure by information against British subjects guilty of extortion in East India.	Special procedure not reproduced. As to substance, see s. 119.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 Geo. III. sess. 2, c. 25. ss. 66-77.	Prosecution of Indian offenders in Parliament.	Not reproduced. These sections contain an elaborate procedure for constituting a special court for the trial of Indian offenders. It was to consist of three judges, four peers, and six members of the House of Commons. See Mill, <i>British India</i> , iv. 497 seq. The machinery has never been put in force, and the whole of this set of provisions is practically obsolete.
ss. 78-82.	Evidence and limitation of proceedings in information under Act.	Not reproduced. Fall with foregoing provisions.
s. 83.	Saving for claims as to territorial acquisitions.	Not reproduced. Made unnecessary by transfer of government to the Crown.
ss. 84, 85.	Commencement of Act . . . Act to be public Act.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1887.
26 Geo. III. c. 57.	The East India Company Act, 1786.	
ss. 1-28.	Prosecution of Indian offenders in Parliament.	Not reproduced. These sections merely amend the machinery under Pitt's Act (24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25).
s. 29.	Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 30.	Jurisdiction of governor's and mayor's court at Madras.	Jurisdiction continued by s. 101. Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 31.	Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1872.
ss. 32-35.	Repealed by 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 140.
ss. 36, 37.	Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1872.
s. 38.	Bonds executed in East Indies to be evidence in Britain, and vice versa.	Repealed as to British India by S. L. R. Act, 1892.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
26 Geo. III. c. 57, s. 39.	Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1892.
33 Geo. III. c. 52, ss. 1-18.	The East India Company Act, 1793.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 19.	Power of commissioners to send orders to India through secret committee of direc- tors.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 36, and 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 27. See s. 14.
s. 20.	Appointment of secret com- mittee of directors.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106. See s. 14.
s. 21.	Dispatches of secret commit- tee, by whom to be pre- pared.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 22.	Secret dispatches from India.	Amended by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 28. Reproduced by s. 14 (2). The enumeration of subjects in s. 22 is not repeated in s. 14 (2). It differs from that given in 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 27, as to dispatches to India.
s. 23.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 24.	Government of Bengal by Gov- ernor-General in Council. Government of Madras and Bombay by Governor in Council. Number of members of council at Madras and Bombay.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 39. See ss. 36, 49. Reproduced by s. 50 (1). The provision as to control of the revenues is superseded by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 41. The provisions as to the military authority of the Madras and Bombay Gov- ernments are repealed by 56 & 57 Vict. c. 62. Modified by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 57. Reproduced by s. 51 (2).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 Geo. III. c. 52, s. 24 (continued).	Governors in Council of Madras and Bombay to be subject to control of Governor-General in Council.	Verbally modified by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 65. Reproduced by s. 49 (1).
s. 25.	Directors to fill vacancies in offices of— Governor-General . . . Governors of Madras and Bombay . . . Members of Council . . .	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 106, s. 29. Not reproduced. Superseded by 32 & 33 Vict. c. 97.
	Governor of the forts and garrisons at Fort William, Fort St. George, and Bombay . . . Commanders-in-chief . . .	Not reproduced. Superseded by 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 30, which has itself been subsequently repealed.
	Qualification for office of member of council of— Governor-General . . . Governor of Madras or Bombay.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 3. Reproduced by s. 51 (3). Provision as to seniority rep. by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, s. 7.
s. 26.	Power for Crown to fill vacancies in default of directors.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 27.	Provisional appointments to offices of— Governor-General, governor, and member of Council. Governor of the forts and garrisons at Fort William, Fort St. George, and Bombay . . . Commanders-in-chief.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 61, and 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 2, 5. Not reproduced. See note on s. 25.
s. 28.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
ss. 29, 30.	Temporary vacancy in office of— Governor-General. Governor.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 50, 51. Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 63.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 Geo. III. c. 52, s. 31.	Temporary vacancy in office of member of council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 64, and 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 27.
s. 32.	Appointment of Commander-in-chief as member of— Governor-General's council. Governor's council. Salary of Commander-in-chief as member of council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 3. Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892. Repealed by 56 & 57 Vict. c. 62. Reproduced by s. 80.
s. 33.	Commander-in-chief in India to be a member of local council while in Madras or Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 51.
s. 34.	Absence or illness of member of council.	Not reproduced. Practically superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 64, and 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 27.
s. 35.	Removal of officers by Crown.	Amended as to communication of order of removal by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 38. Reproduced by s. 21 (1).
s. 36.	Removal of officers by directors of East India Company. Exception as to officers appointed by Crown on default of directors.	Reproduced by s. 21 (2). Not reproduced. Made unnecessary by abolition of Company.
s. 37.	If Governor-General, &c., leaves India intending to return to Europe, his office vacated. Evidence of intention to return to Europe. Resignation of office by Governor-General, &c. Salary and allowances to cease from date of departure or resignation.	Re-enacted in substance by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76. Qualified as to members of council by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 26. Reproduced by s. 82 (1). Not reproduced. 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 79, contains no such provision. Reproduced by s. 82 (2). Reproduced by s. 82 (4).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 Geo. III. c. 52, s. 37 (continued).	Salary and allowances not payable during absence.	Amended by 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 85, s. 79. Reproduced by s. 82 (2).
s. 38.	Power to postpone matters proposed by members of council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Viet. c. 67, s. 8, giving power to make rules of procedure.
s. 39.	Form and signature of proceedings.	Amended by 53 Geo. III. c. 155, s. 179, and Indian Act II of 1834. Reproduced by ss. 43 (1), 54 (1).
s. 40.	Authority of Governor-General in Council over local Governments.	Re-enacted in more general terms by 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 85, s. 39. Reproduced by ss. 36 and 49 (1).
s. 41.	Duty of local Governments in case of conflict between orders of Governor-General in Council and orders of directors of East India Company.	Not reproduced. These elaborate provisions have been made unnecessary and unsuitable by change of circumstances.
s. 42.	Restriction on power of Governor-General in Council to make war or treaty.	Reproduced by s. 48.
s. 43.	Local Governments not to make war or treaty without orders of Governor-General in Council or East India Company.	Reproduced by s. 49 (2).
	Officers of local Governments to obey such orders of Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by s. 49 (1).
	Governor, &c., disobeying orders of Governor-General in Council liable to be suspended or removed.	Not reproduced. See note on s. 49.
s. 44.	Local Governments to keep Governor-General informed of their proceedings.	Reproduced by s. 49 (1).
ss. 45, 46.	Proceedings against persons suspected of dangerous correspondence.	Reproduced by s. 120.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 Geo. III. c. 52, ss. 47-49.	Power for Governor-General or Governor of Madras or Bombay to act against opinion of council.	Modified, as to Governor-General, by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 5. Reproduced by ss. 44 (2), (3), (4), 53 (5).
s. 50.	Person temporarily acting as Governor-General or governor not to act against opinion of council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 65, and 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 50.
s. 51.	Power to act against opinion of council not to be exercised in certain cases.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 5, and by provisions as to Indian legislation.
s. 52.	Powers of local Government superseded by visit of Governor-General.	Not reproduced. Superseded as to Governments of Madras and Bombay by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 67.
s. 53.	Appointment and powers of vice-president during absence of Governor-General.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 6, and by the appointment of a Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.
s. 54.	Power of Governor-General while absent from his council to issue orders to local Governments and officers.	Reproduced by s. 47 (2).
s. 55.	Suspension of Governor-General's power to issue such orders.	Reproduced by s. 47 (3).
s. 56.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, s. 7.
s. 57.	Presidential restriction on civil appointments.	Reproduced by s. 93 (final words).
	Residence required to qualify civil servant for appointment.	Not reproduced. Repealed by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, s. 7.
ss. 58-61.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 62.	Receiving gifts to be a misdemeanour.	Re-enacted by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 76. Reproduced by s. 117 (5).
s. 63.	Disposal of gifts and fines.	Reproduced by s. 117 (last part).
s. 64.	Exception for fees of barristers, &c.	Reproduced by s. 117 (5).
s. 65.	Disobedience and breach of duty.	Re-enacted by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 80. Reproduced by s. 117 (2), (3).
s. 66.	Corrupt bargain for giving up or obtaining employment.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 49 Geo. III, c. 126.
s. 67.	Jurisdiction of courts in India and Great Britain over offences by British subjects in Native States.	See s. 119 (2). Repealed as to Indian courts by Indian Act XI of 1872.
s. 68.	East India Company or its servants not to stay actions without approbation of Board.	Not reproduced. Cf. 13 Geo. III, c. 93, s. 35. Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 69.	East India Company not to release sentence of British or Indian court against its servants.	
s. 70.	Forfeiture of office after absence of five years.	Amended as to military officers by 53 Geo. III, c. 155, s. 84. Not reproduced. Practically superseded by power to make rules as to furlough, &c.
88. 71-130.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1872.
s. 137.	Governor-General, governor, judges of supreme courts, members of council, and judicial and revenue officers in Bengal not to trade.	Reproduced by s. 117 (4).
	British subjects not to trade in salt, &c.	Not reproduced. Repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870.
88. 138, 139.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1872.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 140.	Procedure for offences under Act.	See s. 169.
s. 141.	Procedure, and limitation of time for proceedings.	S. 119 (3), following 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7, substitutes 'five' for 'six' years. The provision in that section as to arrival in England is taken from 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7. The provisions as to procedure are omitted as having been superseded by change of practice.
ss. 142-150.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1872.
s. 151.	Appointment of justices of the peace.	Not reproduced. Rep. by Indian Act II of 1869.
ss. 152-155.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 150.	Admiralty jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Calcutta.	Not reproduced. Effect saved by s. 102 (1), and by Article 33 of the charter of the Calcutta High Court.
s. 157.	Appointment of coroners . .	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 158-160.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
s. 161.	Repealed, 4 & 5 Will. IV, c. 33.
s. 162.	Proceedings in respect of things done under Act to be taken within three years.	See s. 119 (3). Superseded as to India by Indian legislation, see Act IX of 1871.
s. 163.	Repealed as to U. K. by S. L. R. Act, 1887.
37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 1.	The East India Act, 1797. Number of judges of Supreme Court, Calcutta.	Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 2. Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 2, 3.	Pensions of judges . . .	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 6. Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 4.	Depositions	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1878, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
	Salaries and fees of officers of Supreme Court, Calcutta.	
ss. 5-7.	Registration, &c., in Supreme Court, of regulations made by Governor-General in Council.	
s. 8.	Constitution and powers of recorders' courts at Madras and Bombay.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 9, 10.	Jurisdiction of recorders' courts at Madras and Bom- bay.	Reproduced by s. 101. The powers and jurisdiction of the recorders' courts were vested in the supreme courts by 30 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79, s. 5 (Madras), and 4 Geo. IV, c. 71, s. 7 (Bombay).
s. 11.	Governor, members of his council, and recorder ex- empt from arrest or im- prisonment by recorders' courts.	Reproduced by s. 105. See note on 13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 17.
s. 11. proviso.	Governor and his council exempt from jurisdiction of recorders' courts for official act.	Reproduced by s. 105 (1) (a).
	Recorders' courts not to have jurisdiction in matters con- cerning the revenue.	Reproduced, s. 101 (3).
	Exemption of certain classes of persons from jurisdiction of recorders' courts.	Not reproduced. The corre- sponding provisions in 21 Geo. III, c. 79, ss. 9, 10, as to the Supreme Court, Cal- cutta, have been repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870.
s. 12.	Rights of fathers of Hindu and Mahomedan families, and rules of caste, preserved.	Not reproduced. Corresponds to 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 18.
s. 13.	Jurisdiction of recorders' courts, Madras and Bom- bay.	Not reproduced. Saved by s. 101.

'regulated companies.' The members of such a company were subject to certain common regulations, and were entitled to certain common privileges, but each of them traded on his own separate capital, and there was no joint stock. The trading privileges of the East India Company were reserved to the members, their sons at twenty-one, and their apprentices, factors, and servants. The normal mode of admission to full membership of the Company was through the avenue of apprenticeship or service. But there was power to admit 'others,' doubtless on the terms of their offering suitable contributions to the adventure of the Company.

When an association of this kind had obtained valuable concessions and privileges, its natural tendency was to become an extremely close corporation, and to shut its doors to outsiders except on prohibitory terms, and the efforts of those who suffered from the monopoly thus created were directed towards reduction of these terms. Thus by a statute of 1497 the powerful Merchant Adventurers trading with Flanders had been required to reduce to 10 marks (£6 13s. 4d.) the fine payable on admission to their body. By similar enactments in the seventeenth century the Russia Company and Levant Company were compelled to grant privileges of membership on such easy terms as to render them of merely nominal value, and thus to entitle the companies to what, according to Adam Smith, is the highest eulogium which can be justly bestowed on a regulated company, that of being merely useless. The charter of Elizabeth contains nothing specific as to the terms on which admission to the privileges of the Company might be obtained by an outsider. It had not yet been ascertained how far those privileges would be valuable to members of the Company, and oppressive to its rivals.

The chief privilege of the Company was the exclusive right of trading between geographical limits which were practically the Cape of Good Hope on the one hand and the Straits of Magellan on the other, and which afterwards became widely famous as the limits of the Company's charter. The only

Privileges
of Com-
pany.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 13 (continued).	<p>Proviso as to native laws and usages.</p> <p>Power to make rules of procedure for such cases.</p> <p>Appearance and examination of witnesses in such cases.</p>	<p>Reproduced by s. 108. See note to 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 17, <i>supra</i>.</p> <p>Not reproduced. The corresponding provisions in 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 19, as to the Supreme Court, Calcutta, have been repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870.</p>
s. 14.	No action for acts done by or by order of judicial officers.	Not reproduced. Superseded by Indian Act XVIII of 1850.
	Procedure for prosecution of judicial officers.	Not reproduced. The corresponding provisions in 21 Geo. III, c. 70, ss. 24, 25, 26, as to the Supreme Court at Calcutta, have been repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870.
s. 15.	Registration of native servants of East India Company.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 16.	Appeal to His Majesty in Council.	
s. 17.	Transfer of records of mayors' courts, &c., to recorders' courts.	
s. 18.	Jurisdiction of mayors' courts, &c., transferred to recorders' courts.	
ss. 19-26.	Provisions as to recorders	
s. 27.	Forms and rules as to process to be sent to Board for Affairs of India.	Not reproduced. Does not correspond to modern practice.
s. 28.	Loans by British subjects to native princes.	Reproduced by s. 118.
s. 29.	Report by law officers	Not reproduced. Does not require specific enactment.
s. 30.	Jurisdiction of courts of request.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
30 & 40 Geo. III. c. 70, s. 1.	The Government of India Act, 1800. Power of directors of East India Company to apportion territories, revenues, and civil servants between Governments of Madras, Bombay, and Bengal.	Not reproduced. As to territories, superseded by 24 & 25 Viet. c. 67, s. 47, and 28 & 29 Viet. c. 17, ss. 4, 5. See s. 57.
s. 2.	Constitution, powers, and jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Madras.	Reproduced by s. 101. See note to 13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 13, 14, supra.
s. 3.	Exemption of Governor of Madras and Governor-General and their councils from jurisdiction of Supreme Court.	Reproduced by s. 105.
s. 4.	Transfer of records to Supreme Court.	Repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 5.	Transfer of jurisdiction of Supreme Court.	See note to 13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 13, 14, supra. Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 6.	Salaries of Madras judges.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 7.	Salaries of Madras judges to be in place of perquisites.	Not expressly reproduced. Covered by s. 99.
s. 8.	Allowances to Madras judges	Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892. Covered by s. 99.
s. 9.	Salaries of judges of supreme courts at Calcutta and Madras, and Recorder of Bombay, to cease on judge leaving India.	Nor reproduced. Salaries and allowances of high court judges are now fixed by the Secretary of State under 24 & 25 Viet. c. 104, s. 6.
s. 10.	Vacancy in office of Recorder of Bombay.	Repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 11.	Power of Governor of Madras in Council to make regulations.	Repealed by Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 12.	Absence of Governor-General or Governor from his council.	Reproduced as to governors by s. 53. Repealed as to Governor-General, S. L. R. Act, 1892.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79, s. 12 (continued).	Saving of Governor-General's power to appoint a vice-president.	Not reproduced. This power was conferred by 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 53, which has been superseded by 24 & 25 Viet. c. 67, s. 6.
ss. 13-16.	Repealed, 9 Geo. IV, c. 74, s. 126, which section is itself repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 17.	Courts of request	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 18, 19.	Corporal punishment . . .	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 20.	Local extent of jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Calcutta.	Saved by s. 101 (1). Repealed in part, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 21, 22.	Grant of letters of administration.	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
ss. 23, 24.	Insolvent debtors	Repealed, Indian Act XIV of 1870, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 25.	Power to appoint judges of supreme courts at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, commissioners of prize.	Repealed by Prize Courts Act, 1894.
53 Geo. III, c. 155, ss. 1-32.	The East India Company Act, 1813.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
ss. 33-39.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
ss. 40, 41.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 42.	Control of India Board over colleges and seminaries in India.	} Omitted as having been made unnecessary by alteration of circumstances.
s. 43.	Provision to be made for public education.	
ss. 44-48.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 49.	Salaries of bishops and archdeacons.	} Not reproduced. These salaries may now be fixed and altered by the Secretary of State under 43 Viet. c. 3, s. 3.
s. 50.	Such salaries when to commence and cease. Such salaries to be in lieu of fees, &c.	

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
53 Geo. III, c. 155, ss. 51, 52.	Jurisdiction of Bishop of Calcutta.	Reproduced by s. 110. Ss. 51 and 52 extended to bishops of Madras and Bombay, and s. 52 verbally amended by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 92, 93.
s. 53.	Countersignature of ecclesiastical letters patent for Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 47 & 48 Vict. c. 30 (Great Seal Act, 1884).
ss. 54-78.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 79.	Signature of proceedings by the chief secretary or the principal secretary of the department.	Amended by Indian Act II of 1834. Reproduced by ss. 43 (1), 54 (1).
ss. 80, 81.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 82.	Residence required to qualify civil servants for appointments exceeding in value £1,500 per annum.	Not reproduced. Virtually repealed by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, s. 7.
s. 83.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 84.	Absence of military officers for five years.	Not reproduced. See note on 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 70.
s. 85.	Precedence of civil servants returning after five years' absence.	Omitted as having been superseded by rules of service.
s. 86.	Precedence of civil servants .	Omitted on the same ground. S. 56 of 33 Geo. III, c. 52, which this section amends, has been repealed by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, s. 7.
ss. 87, 88.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 89.	Salaries of governor-general, governors of Madras and Bombay, members of council, and judges of high courts, to commence on their taking upon themselves the execution of their office.	Unnecessary, the power to fix the salaries of all these officers being now vested in the Secretary of State.
	Allowances for equipment and voyage.	Repealed by 43 Vict. c. 43, s. 5.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
53 Geo. III, c. 155, ss. 90--92.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 93.	Superannuation allowances of East India Company's servants in England.	Not reproduced. As to officers transferred to Secretary of State's establishment, saved by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 18.
s. 94.	Account of such allowances to be laid before Parliament.	Not reproduced. There is no corresponding provision in 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 18, as to superannuation allowances of officers first appointed to Secretary of State's establishment.
s. 95.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 96.	Power of Governor-General in Council, and the Governors of Madras and Bombay in Council, to make articles of war for native officers and soldiers.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 73; see also 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 22, 43.
ss. 97--110.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1890.
s. 111.	Power of advocates-general at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Prince of Wales' Island, to file informations for debts due to Crown.	Reproduced by s. 109.
ss. 112--122.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 123.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
ss. 124, 125.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
	The Indian Presidency Towns Act, 1815.	
55 Geo. III, c. 84, s. 1.	Power to extend limits of presidency towns.	Reproduced by s. 59. Residue of Act repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
4 Geo. IV, c. 71.	The Indian Bishops and Courts Act, 1823.	
ss. 1, 2.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 3.	Pensions to bishops and archdeacons.	Not reproduced. See note (b) on s. 113. Repealed as to archdeacons by 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 5.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
4 Geo. IV, c. 71, s. 4.	Residence as chaplain to count for pension as archdeacon.	Not reproduced. Unnecessary, in view of the Secretary of State's power under 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 3, to fix allowances.
s. 5.	House to be provided for Bishop of Calcutta. Expenses of visitations of Bishop of Calcutta.) Reproduced by s. 113. Ex- tended to bishops of Ma- dras and Bombay by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 100.
s. 6.	Power of Bishop of Calcutta to admit to holy orders.	
s. 7.	Constitution, powers, and jurisdiction of Supreme Court, Bombay. Exemption of Governor of Bombay and his council, and Governor-General, from jurisdiction of the court.	Reproduced by s. 101. See note to 13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 13, 14, supra. Reproduced by s. 105.
88, s. 10.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 11.	Salaries of judges when to commence. Such salaries to be in lieu of fees, &c.) Not reproduced. Superseded or made unnecessary by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 6.
88, 12, 13.	
88, 14, 16.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
s. 17.	Powers of Supreme Courts, Madras and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 103. See note to 13 Geo. III, c. 63, ss. 13, 14, supra.
s. 18.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
6 Geo. IV, c. 85.	The Indian Salaries and Pensions Act, 1825.	
s. 1, 3.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1800.
s. 4.	Salaries of judges of Supreme Courts, Madras and Bom- bay.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 6.
s. 5.	Payments where judge of Su- preme Court, Recorder of Prince of Wales' Island, or Bishop of Calcutta, dies on voyage to India, &c.	Reproduced in part by s. 113. Repealed, as to Recorder of Prince of Wales' Island, by S. L. R. Act, 1878. Made unnecessary in part by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 6, and 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 3.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
6 Geo. IV, c. 85, ss. 6-14.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1890.
s. 15.	Pension of Bishop of Calcutta.	Not reproduced. See note (b) on s. 113.
7 Geo. IV, c. 56,	The East India Officers' Act, 1826.	
s. 3.	Payments to representatives of deceased officers.	Reproduced by s. 82 (3). Ss. 1 and 2 and residue of Act repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1873.
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 1, 2.	The Government of India Act, 1833. Continuance of powers, &c., of East India Company till April 30, 1854. Property of Company to be held in trust for Crown.	Not reproduced. Spent Not reproduced. Superseded by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, ss. 1, 2.
ss. 3-18.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 19.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1890.
ss. 20-24.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 25.	Control of Commissioners over acts of East India Company.	Reproduced by s. 2 (2).
ss. 26-35.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 36.	Communication of secret orders to India.	Reproduced by s. 14 (1). Amended by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 27.
s. 37.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 38.	Presidency of Fort William to be divided into two presidencies (Bengal and Agra).	Not reproduced. This provision was suspended by 5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52, s. 1, and 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 15, and has never been brought into operation. It is practically superseded by the appointment of a lieutenant-governor for the North-Western Provinces under 5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52, s. 2.
	Power to declare limits of presidencies.	Reproduced by s. 57. This provision is modified by 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, ss. 4, 5.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 39.	Government of India by Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by s. 36. The provision as to control of the revenues of India is superseded by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 41.
s. 40.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
ss. 41, 42.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
ss. 43, 44.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
s. 45.	Laws made by Governor-General in Council— to have same force in India as Acts of Parliament. to be judicially noticed by Indian courts.	Not reproduced. There is no such provision in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67. Not reproduced. Superseded as to laws in force in British India by Indian Act I of 1872, s. 57.
	need not be registered	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 46.	Restrictions on legislation affecting high courts.	Reproduced by s. 63 (3). This restriction is kept in force by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22.
s. 47.	Rules for procedure of Governor-General in Council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 8, 18.
s. 48.	Quorum of Governor-General's legislative council. Quorum of Governor-General's executive council. Equality of votes in— Governor-General's executive council. Governor-General's legislative council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 15. Reproduced by s. 42 (4). Reproduced by s. 44 (1). Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 15.
s. 49.	Repealed, 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 4.
s. 50.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
s. 51.	Saving of power of Parliament— to legislate for India. to control Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by ss. 63, 121.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 51 (continued).	Laws made by Governor-General in Council to be laid before Parliament.	Not reproduced. This provision does not appear to apply to laws made under 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67.
s. 52.	Enactments relating to Governor-General of Bengal to apply to Governor-General of India.	Not expressly reproduced.
ss. 53-55.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 56.	Government of Bengal by Governor in Council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by the appointment of a lieutenant-governor of Bengal under 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 16.
	Government of Madras and Bombay by Governors in Council.	Reproduced by s. 50 (1).
	Number of members of council at Madras and Bombay.	Modified by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 57. Reproduced by s. 51 (2).
	Government of Agra . . .	Not reproduced. There is no Presidency of Agra. See note to 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 38, supra.
s. 57.	Power to revoke or suspend appointment of councils.	Reproduced by s. 50 (3).
	Power to reduce number of members of council.	Reproduced by s. 51 (2).
s. 58.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 59.	Powers of Governor where there is no council.	Reproduced by s. 50.
	Powers of Governor in Council.	} See s. 56.
	Rights, &c., of Governors and members of their councils.	
	Legislation by Governors in Council.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 29, et seq.
	Sanction required to creation of office or grant of salary.	Reproduced by s. 49.
s. 60.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 61.	Power of directors to make provisional appointments to any office, subject, in certain cases, to approval of Crown.	Repealed, as to members of Governor-General's council, by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2. Reproduced, so far as in force, by s. 83.
s. 62.	Member of council to fill vacancy in office of Governor-General.	Reproduced by s. 85 (4), (5). S. 62 is superseded but 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 50, which provides for the Governor of Madras or Bombay acting as Governor-General, but the section is still in force with respect to the interval before the arrival of the governor (see 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 51).
s. 63.	Vacancy in office of Governor to be supplied by member of council, or (if no council) by secretary.	Reproduced by s. 86 (1), (2).
s. 64.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1890.
s. 65.	Authority of Governor-General in Council over certain local Governments.	Reproduced by s. 49 (1).
s. 66.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
s. 67.	Powers of Governors of Madras, Bombay, [and Agra] not suspended by visit of Governor-General.	Reproduced by s. 40 (4).
s. 68.	Governors in Council to keep Governor-General in Council informed of their proceedings.	Reproduced by s. 40 (1).
s. 69.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1890.
s. 70.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
s. 71.	New Presidency of Agra not to affect promotion of officers.	Not reproduced. No Presidency of Agra was ever constituted; see note to 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 38, <i>supra</i> .

restriction imposed on the right of trading within this vast and indefinite area was that the Company were not to 'undertake or address any trade into any country, port, island, haven, city, creek, towns, or places being already in the lawful and actual possession of any such Christian Prince or State as at this present or at any time hereafter shall be in league or amity with us, our heirs and successors, and which doth not or will not accept of such trade.' Subject to this restriction the trade of the older continent was allotted to the adventurers with the same lavish grandeur as that with which the Pope had granted rights of sovereignty over the new continent, and with which in our own day the continent of Africa has been parcelled out among rival chartered companies. The limits of the English charter of 1600 were identical with the limits of the Dutch charter of 1602, and the two charters may be regarded as the Protestant counterclaims to the monopoly claimed under Pope Alexander's Bull. During the first few years of their existence the two Companies carried on their undertakings in co-operation with each other, but they soon began to quarrel, and in 1611 we find the London merchants praying for protection against their Dutch competitors. Projects for amalgamation of the English and Dutch Companies fell through, and during the greater part of the seventeenth century Holland was the most formidable rival and opponent of English trade in the East.

'By virtue of our Prerogative Royal, which we will not in that behalf have argued or brought in question,' the Queen straitly charges and commands her subjects not to infringe the privileges granted by her to the Company, upon pain of forfeitures and other penalties. Nearly a century was to elapse before the Parliament of 1693 formally declared the exercise of this unquestionable prerogative to be illegal as transcending the powers of the Crown. But neither at the beginning nor at the end of the seventeenth century was any doubt entertained as to the expediency, as apart from the constitutionality, of granting a trade monopoly of this descrip-

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 72.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 73.	Power to make articles of war. Judicial notice to be taken of such articles. Saving of prior laws until articles made.	Reproduced by s. 63 (1) (c). Not reproduced. Superseded, as to British India, by In- dian Act I of 1872, s. 57. Not reproduced. Unnecessary. See Indian Act V of 1869.
s. 74.	Removal of officers by Crown.	Amended, as to communica- tion of order of removal, by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 38. Reproduced by s. 21 (1).
s. 75.	Removal of officers by direc- tors of East India Company. Proviso as to officers appointed by Crown on default of directors.	Reproduced by s. 21 (2). Not reproduced. The section (60) as to appointments made in such cases is repealed by the S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 76.	Salaries of Governor-General, governor, and members of their councils.	Reproduced by s. 80. Amend- ed, as to members of the Governor-General's council, by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 4. The salaries of the Governors of Madras and Bombay, and of members of council, have since been fixed by the Secretary of State.
	Governor-general, governors, and members of council not to accept gifts; or to carry on trade.	Reproduced by s. 117 (4); (5).
	Expenses of equipment and voyage.	Repealed by 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 5.
s. 77.	Salary of governor-general, governors, and members of their councils to be reduced by amount of any pension, &c., received by them.	Reproduced by s. 80.
s. 78.	Power to make regulations as to patronage.	Amended by 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 30. Reproduced by s. 90 (1).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 79.	If governor-general, &c., returns to Europe his office vacated. Resignation of office by governor-general, &c. Salary and allowances to cease from date of departure or resignation. Salary and allowances not payable during absence. Payment of salaries and allowances to representatives.	Reproduced by s. 82, except as to mode of resignation. See note on 33 Geo. III, 52, s. 37.
s. 80.	Disobedience and breach of duty.	Reproduced by s. 82 (3).
ss. 81-83.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1800.
s. 84.	Laws to be made against illicit entry or residence.	Not reproduced. This direction has been observed. See Act III of 1804.
s. 85.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1800.
s. 86.	Power to hold land	Omitted as no longer necessary. May be repealed or modified by Indian legislation. See 32 & 33 Vict. c. 96, s. 3.
s. 87.	No disabilities in respect of religion, colour, or place of birth.	Reproduced by s. 91.
s. 88.	Laws to be made for mitigating and abolishing slavery.	Not reproduced. This direction has been observed by the passing of Act V of 1843. Repealed, as to U.K., S. L. R. Act, 1888.
s. 89.	Salaries of Bishops of Madras and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 113. These salaries may now be fixed and altered by the Secretary of State under 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 3.
s. 90.	Salaries of Bishops of Madras and Bombay to be in lieu of fees.	Reproduced by s. 113.
s. 91.	Expenses of equipment and voyage.	Not reproduced. Repealed by 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 5.
s. 92.	Jurisdiction of Bishops of Madras and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 110.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 93.	Power to fix and vary limits of dioceses of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 110.
	Jurisdiction of bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 110.
s. 94.	Bishop of Calcutta to be metropolitan. His jurisdiction Superintendence of archbishop. Subordination of bishops of Madras and Bombay.	} Reproduced by s. 110.
s. 95.	
s. 96.	Pensions of bishops . . .	Not reproduced. See note (b) on s. 113.
s. 97.	Payments where Bishop of Madras or Bombay dies on voyage to India, &c.	Reproduced by s. 113.
s. 98.	Pensions of bishops . . .	Not reproduced. Superseded by 43 Vict. c. 3, s. 3.
s. 99.	Consecration of person resident in India appointed to bishopric of Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 112.
s. 100.	Visitations of bishops of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 113.
s. 101.	Limitation to salary of archdeacon. Limitation to expense to be incurred in respect of bishops and archdeacons.	} Reproduced by s. 113.
s. 102.	Chaplains of Church of Scotland. Grants to other sects . . .	
ss. 103-107.	Repealed, 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 36.
ss. 108-111.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.
s. 112.	Government of St. Helena .	Not reproduced. Excepted from repeal.
ss. 113-117.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1874.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52.	The India (North-West Provinces) Act, 1835.	
s. 1.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1860.
s. 5.	Power to appoint a lieutenant-governor for the North-Western Provinces.	Not reproduced. Spent.
	Qualification for that office	Reproduced by s. 33 (3).
	Power to declare extent of that lieutenant-governor's	
	(1) territories	Not reproduced. Superseded by 28 & 29 Viet. c. 17, s. 4.
	(2) authority	Not reproduced. Superseded by 17 & 18 Viet. c. 77, s. 4.
7 Will. IV, & 1 Viet. c. 47.	The India Officers' Salaries Act, 1837.	
ss. 1, 2, 3.	Leave of absence	See s. 83.
5 & 6 Viet. c. 119.	The Indian Bishops Act, 1842.	
s. 1.	Furlough of bishops	Not reproduced. Superseded by 34 & 35 Viet. c. 62.
	Furlough allowances of bishops	Not reproduced. Superseded by 43 Viet. c. 4, s. 3.
s. 2.	Second furlough of bishops	Not reproduced. Superseded by 34 & 35 Viet. c. 62.
s. 3.	Furlough allowance to but one bishop at a time.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 34 & 35 Viet. c. 62, and 43 Viet. c. 3, s. 3.
s. 4.	Allowance to acting Bishop of Calcutta.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 43 Viet. c. 3, s. 3.
16 & 17 Viet. c. 95.	The Government of India Act, 1853.	
s. 1.	Continuance of powers of East India Company.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 21 & 22 Viet. c. 106, s. 1.
ss. 2 & 14.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 15.	Suspension of 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 38, as to division of Bengal into two presidencies.	Not reproduced. See note to 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 38, supra.
	Continuance of 5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52, s. 2, as to appointment of a lieutenant-governor of the North-Western Provinces.	Not reproduced. See note to 5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52, s. 2, supra.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 16.	Power to declare that the Governor-General shall not be Governor of Bengal. Power to appoint a governor of Bengal.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 5. Not reproduced. Superseded by appointment of lieutenant-governor. See note to 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 46, <i>infra</i> .
	Cesser of power to appoint a deputy-governor of Bengal.	Not reproduced. Unnecessary now that a lieutenant-governor of Bengal has been appointed.
	Power to appoint a lieutenant-governor of Bengal.	Not reproduced. Power exercised.
	Service qualification for office of lieutenant-governor.	Reproduced by s. 55 (3).
	Power to declare and limit authority of Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 4.
s. 17.	Power to constitute one new presidency. Power to authorize the appointment of a lieutenant-governor, and to declare the extent of his authority.	Not reproduced. The power of appointing a lieutenant-governor was exercised and exhausted by the appointment of a lieutenant-governor of the Punjab in 1854.
s. 18.	Repealed, 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 3.
s. 19.	Enactments as to existing presidencies to extend to new presidencies.	Not reproduced.
ss. 20, 21.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
ss. 22-24.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
s. 25.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 26.	Repealed, 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 2.
s. 27.	Fines, forfeitures, and escheats to form part of the revenues of India. Disposal of escheats, &c.	Reproduced by s. 22 (2) (c), (d). Reproduced by s. 34.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 28.	Power to appoint commissioners to report on reforms proposed by the Indian Law Commissioners.	Omitted as unnecessary. The power could, if necessary, be exercised without express legislative authority.
ss. 29-31.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 32.	Regulations as to leave and furlough.	Repealed by s. 80.
ss. 33, 34.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 35.	Salaries of commander-in-chief in India and lieutenant-governors.	Reproduced by s. 80.
ss. 36-43.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
17 & 18 Vict. c. 77.	The Government of India Act, 1854.	
s. 1.	Authority for passing letters patent under the Great Seal Counter-signature of warrants under the Royal Sign Manual	} Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1802.
s. 2.	
s. 3.	Power to take territory under the immediate authority and management of the Governor-General in Council.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
	Saving as to laws	Reproduced by s. 58.
s. 4.	Power to declare authority of Governor, &c., of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces.	Reproduced by s. 56.
s. 5.	Powers as to Bengal not transferred to Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal or North-Western Provinces to vest in Governor-General in Council.	} Not reproduced. Spent.
	Governor-General of India to be no longer Governor of Bengal.	
s. 6.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 7.	Definition of 'India'	See definitions in s. 124.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 8.	Act to be construed with 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95.	Not reproduced.
21 & 22 Vict. c. 108, s. 1.	The Government of India Act, 1858. Transfer of Government of India to the Crown. Definition of 'India' . . .	Not reproduced. Spent; see s. 2 (s. 1 of Digest). See definitions in s. 124.
s. 2.	Government of India by the Crown. Revenues of India . . .	Reproduced by s. 1. Reproduced by s. 22 (1), (2).
s. 3.	Secretary of State to exercise powers of East India Com- pany. Counter - signatures of war- rants.	} Reproduced by s. 2.
s. 4.	Number of Secretaries and Under-Secretaries of State who may sit in House of Commons.	
s. 5.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 6.	Salary of Secretary of State and Under-Secretaries.	Reproduced by s. 2 (3).
s. 7.	Number of members of Coun- cil of India.	Amended by 52 & 53 Vict. c. 65, s. 1. Reproduced by s. 3 (1).
s. 8.	First members of council . .	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 9.	Vacancies in council . . .	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 10.	Not less than nine members of the council to have resided in British India.	Reproduced by s. 3 (3).
s. 11.	Members of council to hold office during good beha- viour. Removal of member on ad- dress of Parliament.	Superseded by 32 & 33 Vict. c. 97, s. 2, except as to mem- bers appointed under 39 Vict. c. 7. Reproduced by s. 3 (6). Reproduced by s. 3 (8).
s. 12.	Seat in council disqualifica- tion for Parliament.	Reproduced by s. 4.
s. 13.	Salary of members of council.	Reproduced by s. 3 (9).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 14.	Repealed, 32 & 33 Vict. c. 97, s. 5, which section is re- pealed by S.L.R. Act, 1883.
ss. 15, 16.	Establishment of Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 18.
s. 17.	Compensation to officers .	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 18.	Superannuation allowance to officers transferred from home establishment of East India Company to Secre- tary of State's establish- ment.	Not reproduced. Personal.
	Superannuation allowance to officers appointed on Secre- tary of State's establish- ment.	Reproduced by s. 19.
s. 19.	Duties of Council of India . Signature and address of orders, &c.	Reproduced by s. 6. Reproduced by s. 15.
s. 20.	Committees of council, &c. .	Reproduced by s. 11.
s. 21.	Vice-president of council .	Reproduced by s. 8 (1), (2).
s. 22.	Quorum of council. . . . Who to preside at meetings . Council may act notwith- standing vacancy. Meetings when to be held .	Reproduced by s. 7 (1). Reproduced by s. 8 (3). Reproduced by s. 7 (2)
s. 23.	Procedure at meetings . .	Reproduced by s. 9.
ss. 24 & 25.	Submission of orders to coun- cil and record of opinions.	Reproduced by s. 12.
s. 26.	Provision for cases of urgency.	Reproduced by s. 13.
s. 27.	Communication of secret or- ders to India.	Reproduced by s. 14 (1).
s. 28.	Secret dispatches to England.	Reproduced by s. 14 (2).
s. 29.	Appointment by Crown of — Governor-general . . . Fourth ordinary member of governor-general's council. Governors of presidencies. Advocates-general . . .	Reproduced by s. 37. Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878. Reproduced by s. 50 (2). Reproduced by s. 109.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 29 (continued).	Appointment of members of councils of governor-general and governors. Appointment of lieutenant-governors.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878. Reproduced by s. 55 (2).
s. 30	Regulations as to the making of appointments in India. Power to restore officers suspended or removed.	Reproduced by s. 90. Not reproduced.
s. 31.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 32.	Regulations for admission to covenanted civil service.	Reproduced by s. 93.
s. 33.	Cadetships and other appointments.	Reproduced in substance by s. 20 (1).
s. 34.	Regulations for admission to cadetships.	Spent.
s. 35.	Selection for cadetships .	Reproduced in substance by s. 20 (1).
s. 36.	Mode of making nominations for cadetships.	Not reproduced. Virtually repealed by abolition of Indian Army.
s. 37.	Regulations as to appointments and admission to service.	Reproduced by s. 20 (2).
s. 38.	Removal of officers by Crown to be communicated to Secretary of State in Council.	Reproduced by s. 21 (1).
s. 39.	Property, &c., of East India Company— To vest in Crown . . . To be applied for purposes of Government of India.	Not reproduced. Spent. Reproduced by s. 22 (3).
s. 40.	Power of Secretary of State— (1) To sell, mortgage, and buy property. (2) To make contracts .	Reproduced by s. 31. Reproduced by s. 32 (1).
s. 41.	Control of Secretary of State over revenues of India.	Reproduced by s. 23.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
21 & 22 Vict. c. 100, s. 42.	Application of revenues. Money vested in Crown or accruing from property to be applied in aid of revenues.	Reproduced by s. 22.
s. 43.	Account of Secretary of State in Council with Bank.	Reproduced by s. 25.
s. 44.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 45.	Stock accounts to be opened at Bank. Every such account to be a public account.	Not reproduced. Spent. Reproduced by s. 25 (5).
s. 46.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 47.	Powers of Secretary of State as to sale and purchase of stock.	Reproduced by s. 22.
s. 48.	Disposal of other securities .	Reproduced by s. 27.
s. 49.	Exercise of borrowing powers.	Reproduced by s. 28.
s. 50.	Forgery of bonds	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1892.
s. 51.	System of issuing warrants for payment.	Not reproduced. Superseded by Order in Council of August 27, 1860.
s. 52.	Audit of Indian accounts .	Reproduced by s. 30.
s. 53.	Accounts to be annually laid before Parliament.	Reproduced by s. 29.
s. 54.	Communication to Parliament of orders for commencing hostilities.	Reproduced by s. 16.
s. 55.	Expenses of military opera- tions beyond the frontier.	Reproduced by s. 24.
s. 56.	Military and naval forces of East India Company trans- ferred to the Crown.	Not reproduced.
s. 57.	Indian forces of Crown . .	Not reproduced. Superseded by 23 & 24 Vict. c. 100.
s. 58.	Servants of East India Com- pany transferred to the Crown.	Not reproduced.

tion. Such monopolies were in strict accordance with the ideas, and were justified by the circumstances, of the time.

In the seventeenth century the conditions under which private trade is now carried on with the East did not exist. Beyond certain narrow territorial limits international law did not run, diplomatic relations had no existence¹. Outside those limits force alone ruled, and trade competition meant war. At the present day territories are annexed for the sake of developing and securing trade. The annexations of the sixteenth century were annexations, not of territory, but of trading grounds. The pressure was the same, the objects were the same, the methods were different. For the successful prosecution of Eastern trade it was necessary to have an association powerful enough to negotiate with native princes, to enforce discipline among its agents and servants, and to drive off European rivals with the strong hand. No Western State could afford to support more than one such association without dissipating its strength. The independent trader, or interloper, was, through his weakness, at the mercy of the foreigner, and, through his irresponsibility, a source of danger to his countrymen. It was because the trade monopoly of the East India Company had outlived the conditions out of which it arose that its extinction in the nineteenth century was greeted with general and just approval.

The powers of making laws and ordinances granted by the charter of Elizabeth did not differ in their general provisions from, and were evidently modelled on, the powers of making by-laws commonly exercised by ordinary municipal and commercial corporations. No copies of any laws made under the early charters are known to exist. They would doubtless have consisted mainly of regulations for the guidance of the Company's factors and apprentices. Unless supplemented by judicial and punitive powers, the early legislative powers of

Legisla-
tive
powers of
Company.

¹ The state of things in European waters was not much better. See the description of piracy in the Mediterranean in the seventeenth century in Masson, *Histoire du Commerce Français dans le Levant*, chap. ii.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
21 & 22 Vict. c. 106,		
s. 59.	Orders of East India Company.	Reproduced by s. 123.
s. 60.	Cesser of functions of proprietors and directors of East India Company.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 61.	Board of Control abolished .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 62.	Records, &c., of East India Company to be delivered to Secretary of State in Council.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 63.	Exercise of powers of governor-general before taking seat in council.	Reproduced by s. 84.
s. 64.	Existing provisions to be applicable to Secretary of State in Council, &c.	Not expressly reproduced. See general saving in s. 121.
s. 65.	Rights and liabilities of the Secretary of State in Council.	Reproduced by s. 35 (1), (2).
s. 66.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 67.	Treaties, liabilities, and contracts of East India Company.	Reproduced by s. 123.
s. 68.	Secretary of State and Council of India not personally liable.	Reproduced by s. 35 (3).
ss. 69, 70.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 71.	East India Company not to be liable in respect of claims arising out of covenants made before Act.	Not reproduced. East India Company dissolved.
ss. 72, 73.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 74.	Commencement of Act .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 75.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
22 & 23 Vict. c. 41,	The Government of India Act, 1859.	
s. 1.	Power to sell, mortgage, and buy property and make contracts in India.	Reproduced by s. 33 (1), (2) (5).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
22 & 23 Vict. c. 41, s. 2.	Form of execution of assurances in India.	Amended by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 59, s. 2. Reproduced by s. 33 (3).
	Enforcement against Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 33 (3).
	Secretary of State, &c., not personally liable.	Reproduced by s. 33 (4).
s. 3.	Mode of signing drafts on Bank of England.	Reproduced by s. 25 (3).
s. 4.	Validity of contracts made before passing of Act.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 5.	Ditto Execution of contracts made by Secretary of State.	{ Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 6.	Actions by or against Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 35 (1).
24 & 25 Vict. c. 54, s. 1.	The Indian Civil Service Act, 1861.	
s. 1.	Validation of appointments .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Offices reserved to covenanted civil service.	Reproduced by s. 93.
ss. 3, 4.	Power to make provisional appointments in certain cases.	Reproduced by s. 95.
s. 5.	Offices not reserved to covenanted civil service.	Covered by s. 20 (2).
s. 6.	Saving as to lieutenant-governor.	Schedule II does not include lieutenant-governor.
s. 7.	Repeal of 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 56, &c.	Not reproduced. Spent.
Sch.	List of offices reserved to covenanted civil service.	Reproduced by Schedule II.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 1.	The Indian Councils Act, 1861.	
s. 1.	Short title	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Repeal of enactments . .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 3.	Number of members of governor-general's council.	Amended by 37 & 38 Vict. c. 91, s. 1. Reproduced by s. 39 (2).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 3 (continued).	Number of appointments to be made by Secretary of State.	Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1878.
	Proportion of members who must have served in India.	Reproduced by s. 39 (3).
	Member to relinquish military duty.	Reproduced by s. 39 (5).
	One member to be a barrister.	Reproduced by s. 39 (4).
	Number of appointments to be made by Crown.	Reproduced by s. 39 (1). All members are now appointed by the Crown. See 32 & 33 Vict. c. 97, s. 8.
	Power to appoint commander-in-chief an extraordinary member.	Reproduced by s. 40 (1).
s. 4.	Present members of governor-general's council to continue.	Not reproduced. Spent.
	Power to appoint a fifth member.	Not reproduced. Spent.
	Salary of members . . .	Reproduced by s. 80.
s. 5.	Power of Secretary of State, or Crown, to make provisional appointment to office of member of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 83.
s. 6.	Appointment and powers of president of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 45.
	Powers of governor-general when absent from council.	Reproduced by s. 47 (1).
s. 7.	Absence of governor-general or president from council.	Reproduced by s. 46.
s. 8.	Power to make rules and orders for governor-general's executive council.	Reproduced by s. 43 (2).
s. 9.	Council where to assemble .	Reproduced by s. 42 (1).
	Governor of Madras or Bombay when to be an extraordinary member of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 40 (2).
	Lieutenant-governor when to be an additional member of the council.	Reproduced by s. 60 (6). As to chief commissioners, see 33 Vict. c. 3, s. 3.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
22 & 23 Vict. c. 41, s. 2.	Form of execution of assurances in India.	Amended by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 59, s. 2. Reproduced by s. 33 (3).
	Enforcement against Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 33 (3).
	Secretary of State, &c., not personally liable.	Reproduced by s. 33 (4).
s. 3.	Mode of signing drafts on Bank of England.	Reproduced by s. 25 (3).
s. 4.	Validity of contracts made before passing of Act.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 5.	Ditto	{ Not reproduced. Spent.
	Execution of contracts made by Secretary of State.	
s. 6.	Actions by or against Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 35 (1).
24 & 25 Vict. c. 51, s. 1.	The Indian Civil Service Act, 1861.	
s. 1.	Validation of appointments .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Offices reserved to covenanted civil service.	Reproduced by s. 93.
ss. 3, 4.	Power to make provisional appointments in certain cases.	Reproduced by s. 95.
s. 5.	Offices not reserved to covenanted civil service.	Covered by s. 20 (2).
s. 6.	Saving as to lieutenant-governor.	Schedule II does not include lieutenant-governor.
s. 7.	Repeal of 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 56, &c.	Not reproduced. Spent.
Sch.	List of offices reserved to covenanted civil service.	Reproduced by Schedule II.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 1.	The Indian Councils Act, 1861.	
s. 1.	Short title	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Repeal of enactments . . .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 3.	Number of members of governor-general's council.	Amended by 37 & 38 Vict. c. 91, s. 1. Reproduced by s. 39 (2).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 3 (continued).	Number of appointments to be made by Secretary of State.	Repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1878.
	Proportion of members who must have served in India.	Reproduced by s. 39 (3).
	Member to relinquish military duty.	Reproduced by s. 39 (5).
	One member to be a barrister.	Reproduced by s. 39 (4).
	Number of appointments to be made by Crown.	Reproduced by s. 39 (1). All members are now appointed by the Crown. See 32 & 33 Vict. c. 97, s. 8.
	Power to appoint commander-in-chief an extraordinary member.	Reproduced by s. 40 (1).
s. 4.	Present members of governor-general's council to continue.	Not reproduced. Spent.
	Power to appoint a fifth member.	Not reproduced. Spent.
	Salary of members . . .	Reproduced by s. 80.
s. 5.	Power of Secretary of State, or Crown, to make provisional appointment to office of member of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 83.
s. 6.	Appointment and powers of president of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 45.
	Powers of governor-general when absent from council.	Reproduced by s. 47 (1).
s. 7.	Absence of governor-general or president from council.	Reproduced by s. 46.
s. 8.	Power to make rules and orders for governor-general's executive council.	Reproduced by s. 43 (2).
s. 9.	Council where to assemble . . .	Reproduced by s. 42 (1).
	Governor of Madras or Bombay when to be an extraordinary member of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 40 (2).
	Lieutenant-governor when to be an additional member of the council.	Reproduced by s. 60 (6). As to chief commissioners, see 33 Vict. c. 3, s. 3.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Viet. c. 67, s. 10.	Appointment of additional members of council for legislation.	Amended by 55 & 56 Viet. c. 14, s. 1. Reproduced by s. 61.
s. 11.	Term of office of additional members.	Reproduced by s. 60.
s. 12.	Resignation of additional member.	Reproduced by s. 88 (1).
s. 13.	Power for governor-general to fill vacancies of additional members.	Repealed, 55 & 56 Viet. c. 14, s. 4.
s. 14.	Incompleteness of proportion of non-official members not to invalidate law.	Reproduced by s. 79 (c).
s. 15.	President, quorum, and casting vote at legislative meetings of the governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 62.
s. 16.	First legislative meeting	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 17.	Times and places of subsequent legislative meetings.	Reproduced by s. 61.
s. 18.	Rules for conduct of legislative business.	Reproduced by s. 67.
s. 19.	Business at legislative meetings.	Amended by 55 & 56 Viet. c. 14, s. 2. Reproduced by s. 64.
s. 20.	Assent of governor-general to acts of his council.	Reproduced by s. 65.
s. 21.	Power of Crown to disallow acts.	Reproduced by s. 66.
s. 22.	Legislative power of Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by s. 63 (1), (4).
	Governor-General in Council not to have power to repeal or affect—	Reproduced by s. 63 (2).
	(1) The Indian Councils Act, 1861, or	Reproduced by s. 63 (2) (a).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22 (continued).	(2) 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, or 22 & 23 Vict. c. 41, or (3) Any Act enabling the Secretary of State to raise money, or (4) The Army Acts, or (5) Any Act of Parliament passed after 1860 affect- ing Her Majesty's Indian territories. Governor-General in Council not to have power to pass laws affecting authority of Parliament, &c.	Not reproduced. So much of these Acts as is now in force is embodied in the Digest. As to 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, ss. 81-86, see 32 & 33 Vict. c. 98, s. 3. Reproduced by s. 63 (2) (c).
s. 23.	Power to make ordinances . Such ordinances may be superseded by Acts.	Reproduced by s. 69. Not reproduced; covered by s. 64 (4).
s. 24.	Laws made by Governor- General in Council not in- valid because affecting pre- rogative of the Crown.	Reproduced by s. 79 (b).
s. 25.	Validation of laws made for the non-regulation pro- vinces.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 26.	Leave of absence to ordinary members of council.	Reproduced by s. 81.
s. 27.	Vacancy in office of ordinary member of council.	Reproduced by s. 87.
s. 28.	Power to make rules and orders for Executive Coun- cils of Madras and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 54 (2).
s. 29.	Appointment of additional members of council for Madras and Bombay.	Reproduced by s. 72.
s. 30.	Term of office of additional members.	Reproduced by s. 71 (7).
s. 31.	Resignation of additional member.	Reproduced by s. 88 (1).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Viet. c. 67, s. 32.	Power for governor of presidency to fill vacancies of additional members.	Not reproduced. Repealed, 55 & 56 Viet. c. 14, s. 4.
s. 33.	Incompleteness of proportion of non-official members not to invalidate law.	Reproduced by s. 79 (c).
s. 34.	President of governor's council.	Reproduced by s. 73 (2).
	Quorum and casting vote at legislative meetings.	Reproduced by s. 72 (1), (4).
s. 35.	First legislative meeting.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 36.	Time and place of legislative meetings.	Reproduced by s. 72 (5).
s. 37.	Rules for conduct of business at legislative meetings.	Reproduced by s. 77 (4).
s. 38.	Business at legislative meetings.	Reproduced by s. 77 (1), (2), (3).
s. 39.	Assent of governor to acts of local council.	Reproduced by s. 78 (1).
s. 40.	Assent of governor-general to such acts.	Reproduced by s. 78 (3), (4).
s. 41.	Power of Crown to disallow such acts.	Reproduced by s. 78 (5), (6).
s. 42.	Legislative powers of local councils.	Reproduced by s. 76 (1).
	Power to repeal laws made in India before 1861.	Amended by 55 & 56 Viet. c. 14, s. 5. Reproduced by s. 76 (4).
	Local legislature not to have power to affect Acts of Parliament.	Reproduced by s. 76 (2).
s. 43.	Sanction required to legislation by local councils in certain cases.	Reproduced by s. 76 (3), (5).
s. 44.	Power to establish legislatures in Bengal, the North-Western Provinces, and the Punjab.	Reproduced by ss. 70, 74.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 45.	Constitution of councils of lieutenant-governors. Procedure at meetings of lieutenant-governor's council.	Reproduced by s. 73 (1), (2), (3). Reproduced by s. 75.
s. 46.	Power to constitute new provinces and to appoint a lieutenant-governor for each, and declare and limit his authority.	Reproduced by s. 74.
s. 47.	Power to fix and alter boundaries. Saving as to laws	Reproduced by s. 74. Reproduced by s. 74.
s. 48.	Legislative powers of Lieutenant-Governors in Council. Nomination of members of lieutenant-governors' councils. Conduct of business in lieutenant-governors' councils. Assent to, and disallowance of, acts of lieutenant-governors' councils.	Reproduced by s. 76. Reproduced by ss. 73, 79 (c), 88. Reproduced by s. 77. Reproduced by s. 78.
s. 49.	Previous assent of Crown to proclamation— Constituting councils Altering boundaries Constituting new provinces	Modified by 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 5. Reproduced by s. 74. Reproduced by s. 74.
ss. 50, 51.	Governor of Madras or Bombay to fill vacancy in office of governor-general.	Reproduced by s. 85.
s. 52.	Saving of certain rights, powers, and things done.	Reproduced by s. 123.
s. 53.	Meaning of term 'in council.'	Effect reproduced by language of Digest, see ss. 50-54, &c.
s. 54.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 1.	The Indian High Courts Act, 1861. Power to establish high courts at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.	Not reproduced. Spent.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 104,		
s. 2.	Constitution of those courts .	Reproduced by s. 96. As to high courts, see s. 17.
s. 3.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 4.	Tenure of office of judges . Resignation of judges to be submitted to governor-general or local Government.	Reproduced by s. 97 (1). Reproduced by s. 97 (2).
s. 5.	Precedence of judges . .	Reproduced by s. 98.
s. 6.	Salaries, &c., of judges . .	Reproduced by s. 99.
s. 7.	Vacancy in office of chief justice or other judge.	Reproduced by s. 100.
s. 8.	Abolition of supreme and sader courts.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 9.	Jurisdiction and powers of high courts.	Not reproduced; saved by s. 101 (1).
s. 10.	Repealed, 28 & 29 Vict. c. 15, s. 2, which section is itself repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 11.	Provisions applicable to supreme courts and judges thereof to apply to high courts and judges thereof.	Reproduced by s. 101.
s. 12.	Pending proceedings . .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 13.	Exercise of jurisdiction by single judges or division courts.	Reproduced by s. 103 (1).
s. 14.	Chief justice to determine what judges shall sit alone or in the division courts.	Reproduced by s. 103 (2)
s. 15.	Powers of high courts with respect to subordinate courts.	Reproduced by s. 102.
s. 16.	Power to establish new high court.	Not reproduced. Exhausted by establishment of high court at Allahabad.
	Number and qualifications of judges of new courts.	Reproduced by ss. 102, 104.
	Provisions applicable to new courts.	

the Company could hardly have been made effectual for any further purpose. But they are of historical interest, as the germ out of which the Anglo-Indian codes were ultimately developed. In this connexion they may be usefully compared with the provisions which, twenty-eight years after the charter of Elizabeth, were granted to the founders of Massachusetts.

Resemblance to
Massachusetts
Company.

In 1628 Charles I granted a charter to the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England. It created a form of government consisting of a governor, deputy governor, and eighteen assistants, and directed them to hold four times a year a general meeting of the Company to be called the 'great and general Court,' in which general court 'the Governor or deputie Governor, and such of the assistants and freemen of the Company as shall be present shall have full power and authority to choose other persons to be free of the Company and to elect and constitute such officers as they shall think fitt for managing the affairs of the said Governor and Company and to make Lawes and Ordinances for the Good and Welfare of the saide Company and for the Government and Ordering of the said Landes and Plantasion and the People inhabiting and to inhabit the same, soe as such Lawes and Ordinances be not contrary or repugnant to the Lawes and Statutes of this our realme of England.' The charter of 1628 was replaced in 1691 by another charter, which followed the same general lines, but gave the government of the colony a less commercial and more political character. The main provisions of the charter of 1691 were transferred bodily to the Massachusetts constitution of 1780, which is now in force, and which, as Mr. Bryce remarks¹, profoundly influenced the convention that prepared the federal constitution of the United States in 1787.

Thus from the same germs were developed the independent republic of the West and the dependent empire of the East

¹ *American Commonwealth*, pt. 2, chap. xxxvii. See also Lyall, *British Dominion in India*, p. 54.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Viet. c. 104, s. 17.	Power to revoke, alter, or supplement letters patent of high courts.	Spent.
s. 18.	Repealed by 28 & 29 Vict. c. 15, s. 2, which section is itself repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 19.	Definition of 'barrister' . Local government	Reproduced by s. 96. Reproduced by ss. 97 (2), 100, 102.
28 & 29 Viet. c. 15,	The Indian High Courts Act, 1865.	
s. 1.	Extension of time for granting new letters patent for high courts.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 3.	Power to make orders altering local limits of jurisdiction of high courts.	} Reproduced by s. 104.
s. 4.	Power to disallow such orders.	
s. 5.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 6.	Saving of legislative powers of Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by s. 104.
28 & 29 Viet. c. 17,	The Government of India Act, 1865.	
s. 1.	Power of Governor-General in Council to legislate for British subjects in Native States.	Reproduced by s. 63 (1) (b).
s. 2.	Foregoing section to be read as part of s. 22 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67.	Section 22 is incorporated in s. 64.
s. 3.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 4.	Power to appoint territorial limits of presidencies and lieutenant-governorships.	Reproduced by s. 57.
s. 5.	Disallowance by Secretary of State of proclamation altering boundaries of province.	Reproduced by s. 57, prov. (2).
	Sanction of Crown to proclamation transferring entire district.	Reproduced by s. 57, prov. (1).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 104.		
s. 2.	Constitution of those courts .	Reproduced by s. 90. As to high courts, see s. 17.
s. 3.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 4.	Tenure of office of judges . Resignation of judges to be submitted to governor-general or local Government.	Reproduced by s. 97 (1). Reproduced by s. 97 (2).
s. 5.	Precedence of judges . . .	Reproduced by s. 98.
s. 6.	Salaries, &c., of judges . . .	Reproduced by s. 99.
s. 7.	Vacancy in office of chief justice or other judge.	Reproduced by s. 100.
s. 8.	Abolition of supreme and sadr courts.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 9.	Jurisdiction and powers of high courts.	Not reproduced; saved by s. 101 (1).
s. 10.	Repealed, 28 & 29 Vict. c. 15, s. 2, which section is itself repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 11.	Provisions applicable to supreme courts and judges thereof to apply to high courts and judges thereof.	Reproduced by s. 101.
s. 12.	Pending proceedings . . .	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 13.	Exercise of jurisdiction by single judges or division courts.	Reproduced by s. 103 (1).
s. 14.	Chief justice to determine what judges shall sit alone or in the division courts.	Reproduced by s. 103 (2)
s. 15.	Powers of high courts with respect to subordinate courts.	Reproduced by s. 102.
s. 16.	Power to establish new high court.	Not reproduced. Exhausted by establishment of high court at Allahabad.
	Number and qualifications of judges of new courts. Provisions applicable to new courts.	Reproduced by ss. 102, 104.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 17.	Power to revoke, alter, or supplement letters patent of high courts.	Spent.
s. 18.	Repealed by 28 & 29 Vict. c. 15, s. 2, which section is itself repealed by S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 19.	Definition of ' barrister ' . Local government	Reproduced by s. 96. Reproduced by ss. 97 (2), 100, 102.
28 & 29 Vict. c. 15,	The Indian High Courts Act, 1865.	
s. 1.	Extension of time for granting new letters patent for high courts.	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 3.	Power to make orders altering local limits of jurisdiction of high courts.	} Reproduced by s. 104.
s. 4.	Power to disallow such orders.	
s. 5.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 6.	Saving of legislative powers of Governor-General in Council.	Reproduced by s. 104.
28 & 29 Vict. c. 17,	The Government of India Act, 1865.	
s. 1.	Power of Governor-General in Council to legislate for British subjects in Native States.	Reproduced by s. 63 (1) (b).
s. 2.	Forgoing section to be read as part of s. 22 of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67.	Section 22 is incorporated in s. 64.
s. 3.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1878.
s. 4.	Power to appoint territorial limits of presidencies and lieutenant-governorships.	Reproduced by s. 57.
s. 5.	Disallowance by Secretary of State of proclamation altering boundaries of province.	Reproduced by s. 57, prov. (2).
	Sanction of Crown to proclamation transferring entire district.	Reproduced by s. 57, prov. (1).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
32 & 33 Vict. c. 97,	The Government of India Act, 1860.	
s. 1.	Vacancies in Council of India to be filled by Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 3 (3).
s. 2.	Term of office of member of Council of India.	Reproduced by s. 3 (4), (5).
s. 3.	Power to reappoint member.	Reproduced by s. 3 (5).
s. 4.	Former Acts to apply to future members.	Effect reproduced by language of Digest.
s. 5.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1883.
s. 6.	Resignation of member	Reproduced by s. 3 (7).
	Pension of members appointed before the Act.	Reproduced by s. 3 (6). Quo. expired ?
s. 7.	Claims to compensation	Reproduced by s. 5.
s. 8.	Appointment of ordinary members of the councils of the governor-general and governors.	Reproduced by ss. 39 (1) and 41 (1).
32 & 33 Vict. c. 98,	The Indian Councils Act, 1860.	
s. 1.	Power of Governor-General in Council to legislate for native Indian subjects.	Reproduced by s. 63 (1) (c).
s. 2.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1883.
s. 3.	Power to repeal or amend ss. 81 to 86 of 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85.	Effect reproduced by language of Digest.
33 & 34 Vict. c. 3,	The Government of India Act, 1870.	
s. 1.	Power to make regulations	Reproduced by s. 68.
s. 2.	Regulations to be sent to Secretary of State.	Reproduced by s. 68 (3).
	Laws and regulations to control and supersede prior regulations.	Reproduced by s. 68 (2).
s. 3.	Lieutenant-governor or chief commissioner, when to be an additional member of governor-general's council.	Reproduced by s. 68 (6).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 4.	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1883.
s. 5.	Power of governor-general to act against opinion of council.	Reproduced by s. 44 (2), (3).
s. 6.	Power to appoint natives of India to offices reserved to the covenanted civil service.	Reproduced by s. 95.
33 & 34 Vict. c. 50, s. 1.	The East India Contracts Act, 1870. Validity of deed, &c. . . .	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1883.
s. 2.	Power to vary form of execution of assurances.	Reproduced by s. 33 (3).
34 & 35 Vict. c. 34, s. 1.	The Indian Councils Act, 1871. Validation of Acts of local legislatures conferring jurisdiction over European British subjects.	Reproduced by s. 79 (c).
s. 2.	Committal of European British subjects.	Not reproduced. Superseded by Indian Act X of 1882, s. 447.
s. 3.	Power of local legislatures to amend and repeal Acts declared valid by Indian Act XXII of 1870.	Not reproduced. Superseded by 55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 5. See s. 76 (4).
34 & 35 Vict. c. 62, s. 1.	The Indian Bishops Act, 1871. Power to make rules as to leave of absence of Indian bishops. Proviso as to limits of expense.	Reproduced by s. 114. Reproduced by s. 113.
37 & 38 Vict. c. 77, s. 13.	The Colonial Clergy Act, 1874. Provisions as to Indian bishops.	Reproduced by s. 110 (5).

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
37 & 38 Vict. c. 91,	The Indian Councils Act, 1874.	
s. 1.	Power to appoint a sixth member to governor-general's council. Provisions as to other members to apply to the sixth member. The sixth member to be called member for public works.	Reproduced by s. 30 (1), (2).
s. 2.	Power to diminish number of members of governor-general's council to five. When number diminished, no temporary appointment to be made.	
s. 3.	Saving of (1) 24 & 25 Vict. c. 62, s. 8, and 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 5. (2) Powers of governor-general in respect of his council.	
39 & 40 Vict. c. 7,	The Council of India Act, 1876.	
s. 1.	Appointment to Council of India of persons with professional or other peculiar qualifications.	Reproduced by s. 3 (6).
43 Vict. c. 3, s. 1.	The Indian Salaries and Allowances Act, 1880.	
	Short title	Not reproduced. Spent.
s. 2.	Allowances of certain officials for equipment and voyage.	Reproduced by ss. 80, 113 (1).
s. 3.	Power to fix salaries and allowances of bishops and archdeacons of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. Saving as to salaries at commencement of Act.	Reproduced by s. 113 (1). Not reproduced. Personal.
s. 4.	Charges on Indian revenues not to be increased.	Reproduced by ss. 80, 113.
s. 5.	Repeal of enactments	Repealed, S. L. R. Act, 1894.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
44 & 45 Vict. c. 63,	The Indian Office Auditor Act, 1881.	
s. 1.	Superannuation allowance of India Office auditor and his assistants.	Reproduced by s. 30 (10) and s. 126.
s. 2.	Short title	Not reproduced.
47 & 48 Vict. c. 38,	The Indian Marine Service Act, 1884.	
s. 1.	Short title	Not reproduced.
ss. 2, 3.	Power of Governor-General in Council to make laws for the Indian Marine Service.	Reproduced by s. 63 (1) (d), (5), (6).
s. 4.	Such laws— to have same force as Acts of Parliament. to be judicially noticed by all courts.	Not reproduced. There is no such provision in 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67. Not reproduced. As to Indian courts, see Indian Act I of 1872, s. 57.
s. 5.	Restriction on legislation affecting high courts.	Reproduced by s. 63 (3).
s. 6.	Power to place Indian Marine Service under Naval Discipline Act in time of war.	Left outstanding.
52 & 53 Vict. c. 65,	The Council of India Reduction Act, 1889.	
s. 1.	Power to reduce number of Council of India.	Reproduced by s. 3 (1).
s. 2.	Short title	Not reproduced.
55 & 56 Vict. c. 14,	The Indian Councils Act, 1892.	
s. 1.	Increase of number of members of Indian legislative councils.	Reproduced by ss. 60, 71, 73.
s. 2.	Business at legislative meetings	Reproduced by ss. 64, 77.
s. 3.	Meaning of expressions referring to Indian territories.	Reproduced by s. 60.
s. 4.	Vacancies in number of additional members of councils.	Reproduced by s. 88.

<i>Session and Chapter.</i>	<i>Title and Short Contents.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
55 & 56 Vict. c. 14.		
s. 5.	Powers of Indian local legislatures.	Reproduced by s. 76.
s. 6.	Definitions	Reproduced by ss. 76, 74, 77.
s. 7.	Saving of powers of Governor General in Council.	Not reproduced.
s. 8.	Short title	Not reproduced.
56 & 57 Vict. c. 70.	The East India Loan Act, 1903.	
s. 5.	Signature of debentures and bills	Reproduced by s. 9.
3 Edw. VII, c. 11.	The Contracts (India Office) Act, 1903.	Reproduced by s. 32.
4 Edw. VII, c. 26.	The Indian Councils Act, 1904.	Reproduced by s. 39.

CHAPTER IV

APPLICATION OF ENGLISH LAW TO NATIVES OF INDIA ¹

ENGLISH law was introduced into India by the charters under which courts of justice were established for the three presidency towns of Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta. The charters introduced the English common and statute law in force at the time, so far as it was applicable to Indian circumstances. The precise date at which English law was so introduced has been a matter of controversy. For instance, it has been doubted whether the English statute of 1728, under which Nuncemar was hanged, was in force in Calcutta at the time of his trial, or of the commission of his offence. So also there has been room for argument as to whether particular English statutes, such as the Mortmain Act, are sufficiently applicable to the circumstances of India as to be in force

Intro-
duction of
English
law into
India.

¹ This chapter is based on a paper read before the Society of Comparative Legislation in 1896.

Among the most accessible authorities on the subject of this chapter are Harington's *Analysis of the Bengal Regulations*, Beaufort's *Digest of the Criminal Law of the Presidency of Fort William*, the introduction to Morley's *Digest of Indian Cases*, the editions published by the Indian Legislative Department of the Statutes relating to India, of the general Acts of the Governor-General in Council, and of the Provincial Codes, and the Index to the enactments relating to India. The numerous volumes of reports by Select Committees and by the Indian Law Commissioners contain a mine of information which has never been properly worked.

The best books on existing Hindu law are those by Mr. J. D. Mayne and by West (Sir Raymond) and Bühler, written for the Madras and Bombay points of view respectively. Sir R. K. Wilson has published a useful *Digest of Anglo-Mahomedan Law*. Reference should also be made to the series of Tagore Law Lectures. Mr. C. I. Tupper and Sir W. H. Rattigan have written on the customary law of the Punjab.

On the general subject dealt with by this chapter see Bryce, *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, Essay II.

there¹. But Indian legislation, and particularly the enactment of the Indian Penal Code, has set at rest most of these questions.

Charter of
1753.

George II's charter of 1753, which reconstituted the mayors' courts in the three presidency towns of Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta, expressly excepted from their jurisdiction all suits and actions between the Indian natives only, and directed that such suits and actions should be determined among themselves, unless both parties should submit them to the determination of the mayor's court. But, according to Mr. Morley, it does not appear that the native inhabitants of Bombay were ever actually exempted from the jurisdiction of the mayor's court, or that any peculiar laws were administered to them in that court².

Warren
Hastings'
'Plan' of
1772.

It was not, however, until the East India Company took over the active administration of the province of Bengal that the question of the law to be applied to natives assumed a seriously practical form. In 1771 the Court of Directors announced their intention of 'standing forth as Diwan'; in other words, of assuming the administration of the revenues of the province, a process which involved the establishment, not merely of revenue officers, but of courts of civil and criminal justice. In the next year Warren Hastings became Governor of Bengal, and one of his first acts was to lay down a plan for the administration of justice in the interior of Bengal. What laws did he find in force? In criminal cases the Mahomedan Government had established its own criminal law, to the exclusion of that of the Hindus. But in civil cases Mahomedans and Hindus respectively were governed by their personal laws, which claimed divine authority, and were enforced by a religious as well as by a civil sanction.

¹ The question is discussed at length in Mr. Whitley Stokes's preface to the first edition of *The Older Statutes relating to India*, reprinted in his *Collection of Statutes relating to India* (Calcutta, 1881). See also the *Mayor of Lyons v. East India Company*, 3 State Trials, N. S., 647, and the other authorities cited in note (a) to s. 108 of the Digest.

² Morley's *Digest*, Introduction, p. clxix.

42.5409
16B
The Massachusetts Company may be taken as the type of the bodies of adventurers who during the early part of the seventeenth century were trading and settling in the newly discovered continent of the West. It may be worth while to glance at the associations of English merchants, who, at the date of the foundation of the East India Company, were trading towards the East. Of these the most important were the Russia or Muscovy Company and the Levant or Turkey Company¹.

Other English trading companies.

The foundations of the Russia Company² were laid by the discoveries of Richard Chancellor. In 1553-54 they were incorporated by charter of Philip and Mary under the name of 'the Merchants and Adventurers for the discovery of lands not before known or frequented by any English.' They were to be governed by a court consisting of one governor (the first to be Sebastian Cabot) and twenty-eight of the most rich, discreet, and learned of the fellowships, of whom four were to be called consuls, and the others assistants. They were to have liberty to resort, not only to all parts of the dominions of 'our cousin and brother, Lord John Bazilowitz, Emperor of all Russia, but to all other parts not known to our subjects.' And none but such as were free of or licensed by the Company were to frequent the parts aforesaid, under forfeiture of ships and merchandise a comprehensive monopoly.

In 1566 the adventurers were again incorporated, not by charter, but by Act of Parliament, under the name of 'the fellowship of English Merchants for discovery of new trade' with a monopoly of trade in Russia, and in the countries

1 A good account of the great trading companies is given by Bouhaïssius, *Les Grandes Compagnies de Commerce* (Paris, 1842). See also Causton and Keene, *The Early Chartered Companies* (1843), the article on 'Colonies, Government of, by Companies' in the *Dictionary of Political Economy*, the article on 'Chartered Companies' in the *Encyclopedia of the Laws of England*, and Egerton, *Origin and Growth of English Colonies* (1844).

2 As to the Russia Company, see the Introduction to *Early Voyages to Russia* in the publications of the Hakluyt Society.

3 This is said to have been the first English statute which established an exclusive mercantile corporation.

The object of the East India Company was to make as little alteration as possible in the existing state of things. Accordingly the country courts were required, in the administration of criminal justice, to be guided by Mahomedan law. But it soon appeared that there were portions of the Mahomedan law which no civilized Government could administer. It was impossible to enforce the law of retaliation for murder, of stoning for sexual immorality, or of mutilation for theft, or to recognize the incapacity of unbelievers to give evidence in cases affecting Mahomedans. The most glaring defects of Mahomedan law were removed by regulations, and an interesting picture of the criminal law, so patched and modified, as it was administered in the country courts of Bengal about the year 1821, is given in Mr. Harington's *Analysis of the Bengal Regulations*¹. The process of repealing, amending, and supplementing the Mahomedan criminal law by enactments based on English principles went on until the Mahomedan law was wholly superseded by the Indian Penal Code in 1860². A general code of criminal procedure followed in 1861, and the process of superseding native by European law, so far as the administration of criminal justice is concerned, was completed by the enactment of the Evidence Act of 1872.

With respect to civil rights, Warren Hastings' plan of 1772 directed, by its twenty-third rule, that 'in all suits regarding marriage, inheritance, and caste, and other³ religious usages and institutions, the laws of the Koran with respect to Mahomedans, and those of the Shaster with respect to Gentus (Hindus) shall be invariably adhered to.' 'Moulavies or Brahmins' were directed to attend the courts for the purpose

¹ See also Sir R. K. Wilson's *Introduction to Anglo-Mahomedan Law*, p. 113; and for a description of the criminal law of India as it existed in 1852, see the evidence given in that year by Mr. F. Millett before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the East India Company's Charter.

² It had been previously superseded, in 1827, by a written code in the Bombay Presidency (Morley, *Digest*, Introduction, pp. cliv, clxxvi).

³ The use of 'other' implies that marriage and inheritance were treated as religious institutions.

Gradual
modification
of
criminal
law.

Observance of
native
rules as to
family
law.

of expounding the law and giving assistance in framing the decrees¹.

The famous 'Regulating Act' of 1773 empowered the Governor-General and Council of Bengal to make rules, ordinances, and regulations for the good order and civil government of the settlement at Port William (Calcutta) and other factories and places subordinate thereto, and in 1780 the Government of Bengal exercised this power by issuing a code of regulations for the administration of justice, which contained a section (27) embodying the provisions and exact words of Warren Hastings' regulation. A revised code of the following year re-enacted this section with the addition of the word 'succession.'

The English Act of 1781 (21 Geo. III, c. 70), which was passed for amending and explaining the Regulating Act, recognized and confirmed the principles laid down by Warren Hastings.

Whilst empowering the Supreme Court at Calcutta to hear and determine all manner of actions and suits against all and singular the inhabitants of Calcutta, it provided (s. 17) that 'their inheritance and succession to lands, rents, and goods, and all matters of contract and dealing between party and party, shall be determined in the case of Mahomedans by the laws and usages of the Mahomedans, and in the case of Gentus (Hindus) by the laws and usages of Gentus; and where one only of the parties shall be a Mahomedan or Gentu, by the laws and usages of the defendant.' It went on to enact (s. 18) that 'in order that regard should be had to the civil and religious usages of the said natives, the rights and authorities of fathers of families and masters of families, according as the same might have been exercised by the Gentu or Mahomedan law, shall be preserved to them respectively within their said families; nor shall any acts done in consequence of the rule and law of caste respecting the members of the said families only be held and adjudged a crime,

¹ This direction was repealed by Act XI of 1864.

although the same may not be held justifiable by the laws of England.' Enactments to the same effect have been introduced into numerous subsequent English and Indian enactments¹.

These provisions of the Act of 1781, and the corresponding provisions of the Act of 1797 relating to the recorders' courts of Madras and Bombay (afterwards superseded by the supreme courts, and now by the high courts), are still in force, but are not included in the list of English statutory provisions which, under the Indian Councils Act of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), Indian legislatures are precluded from altering. Consequently they are alterable, and have in fact been materially affected, by Indian legislation. For instance, the native law of contract has been almost entirely superseded by the Contract Act of 1872 and other Acts. And the respect enjoined for the rights of fathers and masters of families and for the rules of caste did not prevent the Indian legislature from abolishing domestic slavery or suttee.

A Bengal regulation of 1832 (VII of 1832), whilst re-enact-
ing the rules of Warren Hastings which had been embodied in previous regulations, qualified their application by a provision which attracted little attention at the time, but afterwards became the subject of considerable discussion². It declared that these rules 'are intended and shall be held to apply to such persons only as shall be *bona fide* professors of those religions at the time of the application of the law to the case, and were designed for the protection of the rights of such persons, not for the deprivation of the rights of others.

The Lex
Loco Act.

¹ See e.g. 37 Geo. III, c. 142 (relating to the recorders' courts at Madras and Bombay), ss. 12, 13; Bombay Regulation IV of 1827, s. 26; Act IV of 1872, s. 5 (Punjab), as amended by Act XII of 1878; Act III of 1873, s. 10 (Madras); Act XX of 1875, s. 5 (Central Provinces); Act XVIII of 1876, s. 3 (Oudh); Act XII of 1887, s. 37 (Bengal, North-Western Provinces, and Assam); Act XI of 1880, s. 4 (Lower Burma); and clauses 19 and 20 of the Charter of 1865 of the Bengal High Courts, the corresponding clauses of the Madras and Bombay Charters, and clauses 13 and 14 of the Charter of the North-Western Provinces High Court.

² See Morley's *Digest*, Introduction, pp. clxxxiii, clxxxiii.

Whenever, therefore, in any civil suit, the parties to such suits may be of different persuasions, where one party shall be of the Hindu and the other of the Mahomedan persuasion, or where one or more of the parties to such suit shall not be either of the Mahomedan or Hindu persuasion, the laws of those religions shall not be permitted to operate to deprive such party or parties of any property to which, but for the operation of such laws, they would have been entitled. In all such cases the decision shall be governed by the principles of justice, equity, and good conscience; it being clearly understood, however, that this provision shall not be considered as justifying the introduction of the English or any foreign law, or the application to such cases of any rules not sanctioned by those principles.'

In the year 1850 the Government of India passed a law (XXI of 1850) of which the object was to extend the principle of this regulation throughout the territories subject to the government of the East India Company. It declared that 'So much of any law or usage now in force within the territories subject to the government of the East India Company as inflicts on any person forfeiture of right¹ or property, or may be held in any way to impair or affect any right of inheritance, by reason of his or her renouncing or having been excluded from the communion of any religion, or being deprived of caste, shall cease to be enforced as law in the courts of the East India Company, and in the courts established by Royal charter within the said territories.'

This Act, which was known at the time of its passing as the *Lex Loci Act* ², and is still in force, excited considerable opposition among orthodox Hindus as unduly favouring converts, and has been criticized from the Hindu point of

¹ An attempt has been made to argue that this phrase was an accidental misprint for 'rights of property.' But there seems no foundation for this suggestion.

² This title is a misnomer. It was properly applied to other provisions which were subsequently dropped. See the evidence of Mr. Cameron before the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1852.

view with respect to its operation on the guardianship of children in a case where one of two parents had been converted from Hinduism to Mahomedanism.

It will have been observed that Warren Hastings' rule and the enactments based upon it apply only to Hindus and Mahomedans. There are, of course, many natives of India who are neither Hindus nor Mahomedans, such as the Portuguese and Armenian Christians, the Parsees, the Sikhs, the Jains, the Buddhists of Burma and elsewhere, and the Jews. The tendency of the courts and of the legislatures has been to apply to these classes the spirit of Warren Hastings' rule and to leave them in the enjoyment of family law, except so far as they have shown a disposition to place themselves under English law.

When Mountstuart Elphinstone legislated for the territories then recently annexed to the Bombay Presidency, Anglo-Indian administrators had become aware that the sacred or semi-sacred text-books were not such trustworthy guides as they had been supposed to be in the time of Warren Hastings, and that local or personal usages played a much more important part than had previously been attributed to them. Accordingly, the Bombay regulation deviated from the Bengal model by giving precedence to local usage over the written Mahomedan or Hindu law¹. Regulation IV of 1827 (s. 26), which is still in force in the Bombay Presidency, directed that 'The law to be observed in the trial of suits shall be Acts of Parliament and regulations of Government applicable to the case; in the absence of such Acts and regulations, the usage of the country in which the suit arose; if none such appears, the law of the defendant, and, in the absence of specific law and usage, justice, equity, and good conscience alone.' The same principle has since been applied

¹ It is also important to observe that the Mahomedan criminal law had not been introduced into the territories under Bombay to anything like the same extent as into Bengal. See on this subject the Judicial Letters from Bombay of July 29, 1818, pars. 186 seq., printed in the Reports to Parliament on East India Affairs for the year 1819.

to the Punjab, which is pre-eminently the land of customary law, and where neither the sacred text-books of the Hindus nor those of the Mahomedans supply a safe guide to the usages actually observed. In this province the Punjab Laws Act¹ expressly directs the courts to observe any custom applicable to the parties concerned, which is not contrary to justice, equity, or good conscience, and has not been altered or abolished by law, or declared by competent authority to be void.

Native
Christians
and
Arme-
nians.

Native Christians have for the most part placed themselves, or allowed themselves to be placed, under European law. As long ago as 1836 the Armenians of Bengal presented a petition to the Governor-General, in which, after setting forth the destitution of their legal condition, they added, 'As Armenians have ceased to be a nation since the year of our Lord 1375, and no trace of their own law is now to be discovered², your petitioners humbly submit that the law of England is the only one that can, upon any sound principle, be allowed to prevail³.'

Parsees.

The Parsees have obtained the enactment of an intestate succession law of their own (XXI of 1865).

Justice,
equity,
and good
con-
science.

In matters for which neither the authority of Hindu or Mahomedan text-books or advisers nor the regulations and other enactments of the Government supplied sufficient guidance, the judges of the civil courts were usually directed to act in accordance with 'justice, equity, and good conscience.' An Englishman would naturally interpret these words as meaning such rules and principles of English law as he happened to know and considered applicable to the case; and thus, under the influence of English judges, native law and usage were, without express legislation, largely supplemented, modified, and superseded by English law.

State of
law at
passing of

The inquiries and reports which preceded the Charter Act of 1853 directed attention to the unsatisfactory condition

¹ IV of 1872, s. 5, as altered by XII of 1878, s. 1.

² This, of course, is merely the statement of the Bengal Armenians of 1836. See Dareste, *Études d'Histoire du Droit*, pp. 119 sqq.

³ Morley's *Digest*, Introduction, p. clxxxvii.

of the law in British India at that time, and, in particular, to the frequent difficulty of ascertaining what the law was and where it was to be found. The judges of the Calcutta Supreme Court, after describing generally the state of the law, went on to say: 'In this state of circumstances no one can pronounce an opinion or form a judgement, however sound, upon any disputed right of persons respecting which doubt and confusion may not be raised by those who may choose to call it in question; for very few of the public or persons in office at home, not even the law officers, can be expected to have so comprehensive and clear a view of the Indian system as to know readily and familiarly the bearings of each part of it on the rest. There are English Acts of Parliament specially provided for India, and others of which it is doubtful whether they apply to India wholly, or in part, or not at all. There is the English Common Law and Constitution, of which the application is in many respects still more obscure and perplexed; Mahomedan Law and Usage; Hindu Law, Usage, and Scripture; Charters and Letters Patent of the Crown; regulations of the Government, some made declaredly under Acts of Parliament particularly authorizing them, and others which are founded, as some say, on the general power of Government entrusted to the Company by Parliament, and as others assert on their rights as successors of the old Native Governments; some regulations require registry in the Supreme Court, others do not; some have effect generally throughout India, others are peculiar to one presidency or one town. There are commissions of the Governments, and circular orders from the Nizamut Adawlut, and from the Dewanny Adawlut; treaties of the Crown; treaties of the Indian Government; besides inferences drawn at pleasure from the application of the "*droit public*," and the law of nations of Europe, to a state of circumstances which will justify almost any construction of it, or qualification of its force¹.

¹ See Hansard (1833), xviii. 729.

First
Indian
Law Com-
mission.

It was for the purpose of remedying this unsatisfactory state of things that an Indian Law Commission was appointed under the Charter Act of 1833, with Macaulay at its head. The commission sat for many years, and produced several volumes of reports, which in some cases supplied the basis of Indian legislation. But it was not until 1860 that the Indian Penal Code, its most important achievement, was placed on the Indian Statute Book. The first edition of the Code of Civil Procedure had been passed in 1859, and the first edition of the Code of Criminal Procedure was passed in 1861¹. The law of Procedure has been supplemented by the Evidence Act (I of 1872) and the Limitation Act (XV of 1877), and by the Specific Relief Act (I of 1877), which stands on the borderland of substantive and adjective law. These Acts apply to all persons in British India, whether European or native, and wholly displace and supersede native law on the subjects to which they relate.

Penal
Code,
Codes of
Civil and
Criminal
Proce-
dure, &c.

But when the time came for codifying the substantive civil law, it was found necessary to steer clear of, and make exceptions with respect to, important branches of native law.

Indian
Succession
Act.

The Indian Succession Act, 1865 (X of 1865), which is based on English law, is declared by s. 2 to constitute, subject to certain exceptions, the law of British India applicable to all cases of intestate or testamentary succession. But the exceptions are so wide as to exclude almost all natives of India. The provisions of the Act are declared (s. 331) not to apply to the property of any Hindu, Mahomedan, or Buddhist. And the Government of India is empowered (s. 332) to exempt by executive order from the operation of the whole or any part of the Act the members of any race, sect, or tribe in British India, to whom it may be considered impossible or inexpedient to apply those provisions. Two classes of persons have availed themselves of this exemption—Native Christians in Coorg, and Jews in Aden. The former

¹ These are now represented by Act XIV of 1882 and Act V of 1898.

class wished to retain their native rules of succession, notwithstanding their conversion to Christianity. The Jews of British India had agreed to place themselves under the Act, but it was not until some twenty years after the Act had become law that the Jews of Aden, who lived in a territory which is technically part of British India, but who still observed the Mosaic law of succession¹, discovered that they were subject to a new law in the matter of succession. They petitioned to be released from its provisions, and were by executive order remitted to the Pentateuch.

The operation of the Indian Succession Act has, however, been extended by subsequent legislation.

The Oudh Estates Act, 1889 (I of 1869), expressly enabled the taluqdars of Oudh to dispose of their estates by will, and applied certain provisions of the Indian Succession Act to their wills.

The Hindu Wills Act (XXI of 1870) applied certain of its provisions—

- (1) To all wills and codicils made by any Hindu, Jaina, Sikh, or Buddhist, on or after September 1, 1870, within the territories subject to the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, or the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the High Courts of Judicature of Madras and Bombay; and
- (2) To all such wills and codicils made outside those territories and limits so far as relates to immovable property situated within those territories or limits.

But nothing in the Act is to

- (3) Authorize a testator to bequeath property which he could not have alienated *inter vivos*; or
- (4) Deprive any persons of any right of maintenance of which, but for the Act, he could not deprive them by will; or
- (5) Affect any law of adoption or intestate succession; or

¹ See the rulings in Zelophehad's case, Numbers xxvii. 6, xxxvi. 1; and the chapter on Le Droit Israélite in Darceste, *Études d'Histoire du Droit*.

- (6) Authorize any Hindu, Jaina, Sikh, or Buddhist to create in property any interest which he could not have created before September 1, 1870.

Probate
and Ad-
ministra-
tion Act.

The Probate and Administration Act, 1881 (V of 1881), which extends to the whole of British India, applies most of the rules in the Succession Act, 1865, with respect to probate and letters of administration, to the case of every Hindu, Mahomedan, Buddhist, and person exempted under s. 332 of the Indian Succession Act, dying on or after April 1, 1881 (s. 2).

The same section provides that a court is not to receive application for probate or letters of administration until the local Government has, with the previous sanction of the Governor-General in Council by notification in the official 'Gazette,' authorized it so to do. Such notifications have been since given by the local Governments. The Act, however, is merely a permissive measure, and authorizes, but does not require, application for probate or administration. And it must be remembered that Hindus do not, as a rule, make wills.

Indian
Contract
Act.

The Indian Contract Act (IV of 1872) does not cover the whole field of contract law, but, so far as it extends, is general in its application, and supersedes the native law of contract. However, it contains a saving (s. 2) for any statute, Act, or regulation not thereby expressly repealed, and for any usage or custom of trade or incident of contract not inconsistent with its provisions. The saving for statutes has been held to include the enactment of George III, under which matters of contract are, within the presidency towns, but not elsewhere, directed to be regulated by the personal law of the party, and thus, paradoxically enough, certain rules of Hindu law have maintained their footing in the last part of British India where they might have been expected to survive¹.

Negotiable
Instru-
ments Act.

The Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, which corresponds to and formed the precedent for the English Bills of Exchange Act, extends to the whole of British India, but is declared

¹ See note (a) to s. 108 of Digest,

of Armenia, Media, Hyrcania, Persia, and the Caspian Sea.

In the seventeenth century they were compelled by the Czar of the time to share with the Dutch their trading privileges from the Russian Government, and by an Act of 1668, which reduced their admission fine to £5¹, their doors were thrown open. After this they sank into insignificance.

A faint legal trace of their ancient privileges survives in the extra-territorial character belonging for marriage purposes to the churches and chapels formerly attached to their factories in Russia. Some years ago they existed, perhaps they still exist, as a dining club².

Levant
Company

✓ The Levant Company³ was founded by Queen Elizabeth for the purpose of developing the trade with Turkey under the concessions then recently granted by the Ottoman Porte. Under arrangements made with various Christian powers and known as the Capitulations, foreigners trading or residing in Turkey were withdrawn from Turkish jurisdiction for most civil and criminal purposes. The first of the Capitulations granted to England bears date in the year 1579, and the first charter of the Levant Company was granted two years afterwards, in 1581. This charter was extended in 1597, renewed by James I, confirmed by Charles II, and, like the East India Company's charters, recognized and modified by various Acts of Parliament.

The Levant Company attempted to open an overland trade to the East Indies, and sent merchants from Aleppo to Bagdad and thence down the Persian Gulf. These merchants obtained articles at Lahore and Agra, in Bengal, and at Malacca, and on their return to England brought information of the profits to be acquired by a trade to the East Indies. In 1593 the Levant Company obtained a new charter, empowering them to trade to India overland through the terri-

¹ 10 & 11 Will. III, c. 6.

² MacCulloch, *Dictionary of Commerce*, 1871 edition.

³ As to the Levant Company and the Capitulations, see below, p.

(s. 1) not to affect any local usage relating to any instrument in an Oriental language. It therefore preserves the customary rules as to the construction and effect of 'hundis,' or native bills of exchange and promissory notes, except so far as those rules are excluded by the agreement of the parties¹.

The Transfer of Property Act, 1882, which lays down rules with respect to the sale, gift, exchange, mortgage, and leasing of land, and on other points supplements the Contract Act, does not apply to the Punjab or to Burma (except the town of Rangoon); and, within the parts of India to which it extends, it reserves, or keeps in operation, native rules and customs on certain important subjects. For instance, nothing in the Act is to affect the provisions of any enactment not thereby expressly repealed, e. g. the Indian Acts which expressly save local usages in the Punjab and elsewhere. And nothing in the second chapter, which relates to the transfer of property by the act of parties, is to affect any rule of Hindu, Mahomedan, or Buddhist law (s. 2). The provisions as to mortgages recognize and regulate forms of security in accordance with native as well as English usage. Local usages with respect to apportionment of rents and other periodical payments (s. 36), mortgages (s. 98), and leases (ss. 106, 108), are expressly saved. And finally, there is a general declaration (s. 117) that none of the provisions of the chapter relating to leases are to apply to leases for agricultural purposes, except so far as they may be applied thereto by the local Government, with the sanction of the Government of India. Thus the application of these provisions is confined within very narrow limits. The law relating to the tenure of agricultural land is mostly regulated by special Acts, such as the Bengal Tenancy Act (VIII of 1885), and the similar Acts for other provinces.

The Indian Trusts Act, 1882 (II of 1882), which codifies the law of trusts, does not apply to the province of Bengal ^{Trusts Act,}

¹ It is said, however, that the Indian banks refuse to discount hundis unless the parties agree to be bound by the Act.

or to the Presidency of Bombay. And nothing in it is to affect the rules of Mahomedan law as to *wakf*, or the mutual relations of the members of an undivided family as determined by any customary or personal law, or to apply to public or private religious or charitable endowments (s. 1).

Easements
Act.

The Indian Easements Act, 1882 (V of 1882), which is in force in most parts of India outside Bengal¹, also embodies principles of English law, but is not to derogate from certain Government and customary rights (s. 1).

Guardian
and
Wards
Act.

The Guardian and Wards Acts, 1890 (VIII of 1890), which declares the law with respect to the appointment, duties, rights, and liabilities of guardians of minors², provides (s. 6) that, in the case of a minor who is not a European British subject, nothing in the Act is to be construed as taking away or derogating from any power to appoint a guardian which is valid by the law to which the minor is subject. And in the appointment of a guardian the court is, subject to certain directions, to be guided by what, *consistently with the law to which the minor is subject*, appears in the circumstances to be for the welfare of the minor (s. 17).

Law of
torts.

The law of torts or civil wrongs, as administered by the courts of British India, whether to Europeans or to natives, is practically English law. The draft of a bill to codify it was prepared some years ago, but the measure has never been introduced.

Subjects
to which
English
and native
law re-
spectively
apply.

If we survey the whole field of law, as administered by the British Indian courts, and examine the extent to which it consists of English and of native law respectively, we shall find that Warren Hastings' famous rule, though not binding on the Indian legislatures, still indicates the class of subjects with which the Indian legislatures have been chary of inter-

¹ Its operation was extended by Act VIII of 1891.

² The age of majority for persons domiciled in British India is by Act IX of 1875 (as amended by s. 52 of Act VIII of 1890) fixed at eighteen, except where before the attainment of that age a guardian has been appointed for the minor by the court, or his property has been placed under the superintendence of the Court of Wards, in which case the minority lasts until twenty-one.

fering, and which they have been disposed to leave to the domain of native law and usage.

The criminal law and the law of civil and criminal procedure are based wholly on English principles. So also, subject to some few exceptions ¹, are the law of contract and the law of torts, or civil wrongs.

But within the domain of family law, including the greater part of the law of succession and inheritance, natives still retain their personal law, either modified or formulated, to some extent, by Anglo-Indian legislation. Hindus retain their law of marriage, of adoption, of the joint family, of partition, of succession. Mahomedans retain their law of marriage, of testamentary and intestate succession, and of *wakf* or quasi-religious trusts. The important branch of law relating to the tenure of land, as embodied in the Rent and Revenue Acts and regulations of the different provinces, though based on Indian customs, exhibits a struggle and compromise between English and Indian principles.

It will have been seen that the East India Company began by attempting to govern natives by native law, Englishmen by English law. This is the natural system to apply in a conquered country, or in a vassal State—that is to say, in a State where complete sovereignty has not been assumed by the dominant power. It is the system which involves the least disturbance. It is the system which was applied by the barbarian conquerors of the provinces of the Roman Empire, and which gave rise to the system of personal law that plays so large a part in the long history of the decay of that empire. It appears to be the system now in force in Tunis, where the French have practically established an exclusive protectorate, and where French law appears to be administered by French courts to Frenchmen and European foreigners, and Mahomedan law by Mahomedan courts to

Attempt
to govern
natives by
native law,
English-
men by
English
law.

¹ e.g. the Mahomedan rules as to the right of pre-emption, which are expressly recognized by the Punjab Laws Act, 1872 (as amended by Act XII of 1878), and by the Oudh Laws Act, 1876.

the natives of the country. It is the system which is applied, with important local variations, in the British protectorates established in different parts of the world over uncivilized or semi-civilized countries. The variations are important, because the extent to which native laws and usages can be recognized and enforced depends materially on the degree of civilization to which the vassal State has attained.

Causes of
its failure.

The system broke down in India from various causes.

In the first place there was the difficulty of ascertaining the native law.

Warren Hastings did his best to remove this difficulty by procuring the translation or compilation of standard text-books, such as the Hedaya, the Sirajiyah, and the Sharifyah for Mahomedan law, the Code of Manu, the Mitakshara, and the Dayabhaga for Hindu law, and by enlisting the services of native law officers as assessors of the Company's courts. His regulations were based on the assumption that the natives of India could be roughly divided into Mahomedans and Gentus, and that there was a body of law applicable to these two classes respectively. But this simple and easy classification, as we now know, by no means corresponds to the facts. There are large classes who are neither Mahomedans nor Hindus. There are various schools of Mahomedan law. There are Mahomedans whose rules of inheritance are based, not on the Koran, but on Hindu or other non-Mahomedan usages. Hinduism is a term of the most indefinite import. Different text-books are recognized as authoritative in different parts of India and among different classes of Hindus. Even where they are so recognized, they often represent what the compiler thought the law ought to be rather than what it actually is or ever was. Local, tribal, caste, and family usages play a far larger part than had originally been supposed, and this important fact has been recognized in later Indian legislation.

Then, the native law, even where it could be ascertained, was defective. There were large and important branches of

law, such as the law of contract, for which it supplied insufficient guidance. Its defects had to be supplied by English judges and magistrates from their remembrance, often imperfect, of principles of English law, which were applied under the name of justice, equity, and good conscience.

And lastly, native law often embodied rules repugnant to the traditions and morality of the ruling race. An English magistrate could not enforce, an English Government could not recognize, the unregenerate criminal law of Indian Mahomedanism.

Thus native law was eaten into at every point by English case law, and by regulations of the Indian legislatures.

Hence the chaos described in the passage quoted above from the report of the Calcutta judges.

This chaos led up to the period of codification, which was ushered in by Macaulay's Commission of 1833, and which, after the lapse of many years, bore fruit in the Anglo-Indian codes.

Reason for
codifica-
tion.

In India, as elsewhere, codification has been brought about by the pressure of practical needs. On the continent of Europe the growth of the spirit of nationality, and the consequent strengthening of the central Government and fusion of petty sovereignties or half-sovereignties, has brought into strong relief the practical inconvenience arising from the co-existence of different systems of law in a single State. Hence the French codes, the Italian codes, and the German codes. If codification has lagged behind in England, it has been largely, perhaps mainly, because England acquired a strong central Government, and attained to practical unity of law, centuries before any continental State¹.

In India it became necessary to draw up for the guidance of untrained judges and magistrates a set of rules which they could easily understand, and which were adapted to the circumstances of the country. There has been a tendency, on the one hand, to overpraise the formal merits of the

Merits of
Indian
Codes.

¹ See Chap. viii of my *Legislative Methods and Forms*.

Indian codes, and on the other to underrate their practical utility as instruments of government. Their workmanship, judged by European standards, is often rough, but they are on the whole well adapted to the conditions which they were intended to meet. An attempt has been made to indicate in this chapter the extent to which they have supplanted or modified native law and custom.

How far
codifica-
tion ap-
plicable
to native
law.

It has often been suggested that the process of codification should be deliberately extended to native law, and that an attempt should be made, by means of codes, to define and simplify the leading rules of Hindu and Mahomedan law, without altering their substance. Sir Roland Wilson, in particular, has pleaded for the codification of Anglo-Mahomedan law. There is, however, reason to believe that he has much underrated the difficulties of such a task. Those difficulties arise, not merely from the tendency of codification to stereotype rules which, under the silent influence of social and political forces, are in process of change, but from the natural sensitiveness of Hindus and Mahomedans about legislative interference with matters closely touching their religious usages and observances, and from the impossibility in many cases of formulating rules in any shape which will meet with general acceptance. It is easy enough to find an enlightened Hindu or Mahomedan, like the late Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, who will testify to the general desire of the natives to have their laws codified. The difficulty begins when a particular code is presented in a concrete form. Even in the case of such a small community as the Khojas, who have contrived to combine adhesion to the Mahomedan creed with retention of certain Hindu customs, it has, up to this time, been found impossible to frame a set of rules of inheritance on which the leaders of the sect will agree. And any code not based on general agreement would either cause dangerous discontent or remain a dead letter. The misconceptions which arose about the Guardians and Wards Act, the authors of which expressly disavowed any intention of

altering native law, illustrate the sensitiveness which prevails about such matters.

And what, after all, is a code ? It is a text-book enacted by the legislature. Several of the Anglo-Indian codes extend only to particular provinces of British India. But, as clear and accurate statements of the law, they possess much authority in the provinces to which they have not been formally extended. Indeed, it was Sir Henry Maine's view that the proper mode of codifying for India was to apply a code in the first instance to a particular province, where its enactment would meet with no opposition, and gradually extend its operation after the country had become familiarized with its contents, and accepted it as a satisfactory statement of the law. When this stage had been reached, what had been used as a text-book might be converted into a law. Now, the author of a text-book enjoys many advantages over the legislators who enact a code. He can guard himself by expressions such as 'it is doubtful whether' and 'there is authority for holding.' And he can correct any error or omission without going to the legislature. If a digest such as Sir Roland Wilson's obtains general acceptance with the courts which have to administer Anglo-Mahomedan law, it will supply an excellent foundation for a future code of that law. But the time for framing such a code has not yet arrived.

Codes and
text-
books.

CHAPTER V

BRITISH JURISDICTION IN NATIVE STATES

It seems desirable to consider, somewhat more fully than has been possible within the compass of the foregoing chapters, the powers of the Indian legislative, executive, and judicial authorities with respect to persons and things outside the territorial limits of British India, particularly in the territories of the Native States of India. For this purpose it may be convenient to examine, in the first instance, the principles applying to extra-territorial legislation in England, and then to consider what modifications those principles require in their application to India. This is the more important because the Indian Act regulating the exercise of extra-territorial jurisdiction was to a great extent copied from the English Act which had been passed for similar purposes.

Territorial
character
of Parlia-
mentary
legisla-
tion.

Parliamentary legislation is primarily territorial. An Act of Parliament *prima facie* applies to all persons and things within the United Kingdom, and not to any persons or things outside the United Kingdom¹. In exercising its power to legislate for any part of the King's dominions Parliament is guided both by constitutional and by practical considerations. It does not legislate for a colony having responsible government, except on matters which are clearly Imperial in their nature, or are beyond the powers of the colonial legislature. And, apart from constitutional considerations, it is reluctant to deal with matters which are within the competence of a local legislature.

Principles
limiting
extra-
territorial
legisla-
tion.

In dealing with persons and things outside the King's dominions Parliament is always presumed to act in accordance with the rules and principles of international law, and its enactments are construed by the courts accordingly. It would be contrary to the received principles of international

¹ See *R. v. Jameson*, [1896] 2 Q. B. 425, 430.

law¹ regulating the relations between independent States for Parliament to pass a law punishing a foreigner for an offence committed on foreign territory, or setting up courts in foreign territory. It would not be contrary to those principles for Parliament to pass a law punishing a British subject for an offence committed in foreign territory, or giving English or other British courts jurisdiction in respect of offences so committed. But Parliament is reluctant, more reluctant than the legislatures of continental States, to legislate with respect to offences committed by British subjects in foreign territory. Its reluctance is based partly on the traditions and principles of English criminal law, as indicated by the averment that an offence is committed against the peace of the King, an expression inappropriate to foreign territory, and by the rules as to venue and local juries; partly on the practical inconvenience of withdrawing offences from the cognizance of local courts to a court at a distance from the scene of the offence and from the region in which evidence is most readily obtainable. The difficulty about evidence is felt more strongly by British courts than by the courts of some other countries, where there is less reluctance to try offences on paper evidence².

¹ i. e. to the principles of international law as understood and recognized by England and the United States. But continental States have asserted the right to punish foreigners for offences committed in foreign territories, especially for acts which attack the social existence of the State in question and endanger its security, and are not provided against by the penal law of the country in the territory of which they have taken place. Westlake, *Chapter on International Law*, p. 127. And the principles of European international law cannot be applied, except with serious modifications, to States outside the European or Western family of nations.

² See Jenkyns' *British Rule and Jurisdiction*, p. 128. As to the principles on which different States have exercised their powers of punishing offences committed abroad, see Heffter, *Droit International* (fourth French edition), p. 86, note G. Where an offender has escaped from the country in which the offence was committed he can often be handed over for trial under the Extradition Acts, 1870 to 1895, which apply as between British and foreign territory, or under the Fugitive Offenders Act, 1881, which applies as between different parts of the British dominions. Thus the procedure under these Acts often supplies a substitute for the exercise of extra-territorial jurisdiction.

These general principles appear to be consistent with the canons for the construction of statutes laid down in the Jameson case of 1896¹ :—

‘It may be said generally that the area within which a statute is to operate, and the persons against whom it is to operate, are to be gathered from the language and purview of the particular statute. But there may be suggested some general rules—for instance, if there be nothing which points to a contrary intention, the statute will be taken to apply only to the United Kingdom. But whether it be confined in its operation to the United Kingdom, or whether, as is the case here², it be applied to the whole of the Queen’s dominions, it will be taken to apply to all the persons in the United Kingdom, or in the Queen’s dominions, as the case may be, including foreigners who during their residence there owe temporary allegiance to Her Majesty. And, according to its context, it may be taken to apply to the Queen’s subjects everywhere, whether within the Queen’s dominions or without. One other general canon of construction is this—that if any construction otherwise be possible, an Act will not be construed as applying to foreigners in respect to acts done by them outside the dominions of the sovereign power enacting. That is a rule based on international law, by which one sovereign power is bound to respect the subjects and the rights of all other sovereign powers outside its own territory.’

Cases in which Parliament legislates for offences committed out of British territory.

Under these circumstances the classes of cases in which Parliamentary legislation has given jurisdiction to British courts in respect of offences committed out of British territory are not numerous. The most important of them are as follows :—

- (1) Offences committed at sea.
- (2) Treason.
- (3) Murder and manslaughter.
- (4) Slave trade offences.
- (5) Offences against the Explosive Substances Act, 1883.
- (6) Offences, such as forgery and perjury, committed abroad with reference to proceedings in some British court.
- (7) Bigamy.
- (8) Offences against certain provisions of the Foreign Enlistment Act, 1870.

¹ *R. v. Jameson*, [1896] 2 Q. B. 425, 435. Judgement of Lord Russell, L. C. J., on demurrer to indictment.

² See 33 & 34 Vict. c. 90, s. 2.

tores of the Grand Signor. Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find members of the Levant Company taking an active part in the promotion of the East India Company. Indeed the latter Company was in a sense the outgrowth of the former. Alderman Thomas Smith, the first Governor of the East India Company, was at the same time Governor of the Levant Company, and the adventures of the two Companies were at the outset intimately connected with each other. At the end of the first volume of court minutes of the East India Company are copies of several letters sent to Constantinople by the Levant Company.

Had history taken a different course, the Levant Company might have founded on the shores of the Mediterranean an empire built up of fragments of the dominions of the Ottoman Porte, as the East India Company founded on the shores of the Bay of Bengal an empire built up of fragments of the dominions of the Great Mogul. But England was not a Mediterranean power, trade with the East had been deflected from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and the causes which had destroyed the Italian merchant states were fatal to the Levant Company. As the East India Company grew, the Levant Company dwindled, and in 1825 it was formally dissolved.

To return to the East India Company.

During the first twelve years of its existence, the Company traded on the principle of each subscriber contributing separately to the expense of each voyage, and reaping the whole profits of his subscription. The voyages during these years are therefore known in the annals of the Company as the 'separate voyages.' But, after 1612, the subscribers threw their contributions into a 'joint stock,' and thus converted themselves from a regulated company into a joint-stock company, which however differed widely in its constitution from the joint-stock companies of the present day.

In the meantime James I had in 1609 renewed the charter of Elizabeth, and made it perpetual, subject to determination

James I's
charter of
1609.

(1) The exercise by English courts of jurisdiction in respect of offences committed on the high seas arises from the necessities of the case, i.e. from the absence of territorial jurisdiction. These offences, being committed outside the body of any English county, could not be dealt with by the ordinary criminal courts of the country, in the exercise of their ordinary criminal jurisdiction. They were originally dealt with by the court of the admiral, but are now, under various enactments, triable by ordinary courts of criminal jurisdiction as if committed within the local jurisdiction of those courts¹. Offences
at sea. *

The jurisdiction extends to offences committed on board a British ship, whether the ship is on the open sea or in foreign territorial waters below bridges, and whether the offender is or is not a British subject or a member of the crew, and although there may be concurrent jurisdiction in a foreign court². The principle on which Parliament exercises legislative, and the courts judicial, powers, is that a British ship is to be treated as if it were an outlying piece of British territory³. Theoretically, Parliament might, without bringing itself into conflict with the rules of international law, legislate in every case in respect of an offence committed by a British subject on board a foreign ship when on the high seas. But it has abstained from doing so in cases where the British subject is a member of the crew of the foreign ship, because he may be treated as having accepted foreign law for the time, and because of the practical difficulties which would arise if members of the same crew were subject to two different laws in respect of the same offence.

The principles on which Parliament has exercised its legislative powers with respect to offences on board ship are

¹ See 4 & 5 Will. IV, c. 36, s. 22; 24 & 25 Vict. cc. 94 and 97; 57 & 58 Vict. c. 60, s. 684; and as to the Colonies, 12 & 13 Vict. c. 96.

² *R. v. Anderson*, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 161; *R. v. Carr*, 10 Q. B. D. 76. The rule is subject to modifications in the case of alien enemies, or aliens on board English ships against their will. See Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law*, ii. 4-8.

³ The analogy is not complete. For instance, a British ship in foreign territorial waters is, or may be, subject to a double jurisdiction.

illustrated by ss. 686 and 687 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict. c. 60), which run as follows :—

‘686.—(1) Where any person, being a British subject, is charged with having committed any offence on board any British ship on the high seas, or in any foreign port or harbour, or on board any foreign ship to which he does not belong, or, not being a British subject, is charged with having committed any offence on board any British ship on the high seas, and that person is found within the jurisdiction of any court in Her Majesty’s dominions, which would have had cognizance of the offence if it had been committed on board a British ship within the limits of its ordinary jurisdiction, that court shall have jurisdiction to try the offence as if it had been so committed.

12 & 13
Vict. c. 96. (2) Nothing in this section shall affect the Admiralty Offences (Colonial) Act, 1840.

‘687. All offences against property or person committed in or at any place either ashore or afloat out of Her Majesty’s dominions by any master, seaman, or apprentice, who at the time when the offence was committed is, or within three months previously has been, employed in any British ship, shall be deemed to be offences of the same nature respectively, and be liable to the same punishment respectively, and be inquired of, heard, tried, determined, and adjudged in the same manner and by the same courts and in the same places as if those offences had been committed within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty of England ; and the costs and expenses of the prosecution of any such offence may be directed to be paid as in the case of costs and expenses of prosecutions for offences committed within the jurisdiction of the Admiralty of England.’

Section 689 gives powers of arrest, &c., in cases where jurisdiction may be exercised under s. 687.

It will be observed that s. 686 draws a distinction between British subjects and others, and between British subjects who do, and those who do not, belong to a foreign ship. The terms in which s. 687 are expressed are very wide, and it is possible that English courts in construing them would limit their application with reference to the principles of international law. See the remarks in *R. v. Anderson*, where the case was decided independently of the enactment reproduced by this section¹.

¹ Piracy by the law of nations, committed on the open sea, whether by a British subject or not, is triable by an English court under the criminal jurisdiction derived from the Admiralty. But this jurisdiction is not conferred by any special statute. As to what constitutes piracy *jure gentium*, see *Attorney-General for the Colony of Hong Kong v. Kwok-a-Sing*, L.R. 5 P. C. 179, 199 (1873), and Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law*, ii. 27.

(2) Treason committed abroad is triable in England under Treason. an Act of 1543-4 (35 Henry VIII, c. 2). Treason, if committed in the territory of a foreign State, may very possibly not be an offence against the law of that State, and therefore not be punishable by the courts of that State.

(3) Murder committed by a British subject in foreign Murder and manslaughter. territory was made triable in England under a special commission of oyer and terminer by an Act of Henry VIII (33 Henry VIII, c. 23). It was by a special commission under this Act that Governor Wall was, in 1802, tried and convicted of a murder committed in 1782¹. The Act was extended by an Act of 1803 (43 Geo. III, c. 113, s. 6) to accessories before the fact and to manslaughter. Both these enactments were repealed by an Act of 1828 (9 Geo. IV, c. 31), which re-enacted their provisions with modifications as to procedure. The Act of 1828 was repealed and reproduced with modifications by an enactment in one of the consolidating Acts of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 9), which is the existing law.

(4) Offences against the Slave Trade Acts are triable by Slave trade offences. English courts if committed by any person within the King's dominions or by any British subject elsewhere (see 5 Geo. IV, c. 114, ss. 9, 10).

(5) Offences against the Explosive Substances Act, 1883 Offences against Explosive Substances Act. (46 & 47 Vict. c. 3), i.e. offences by dynamiters, are triable by English courts when committed by any person in any part of the King's dominions or by any British subject elsewhere.

(6) Offences such as forgery and perjury, when committed Forgery and perjury. with reference to proceedings in English courts, are triable by those courts (see, e.g., 52 & 53 Vict. c. 10, s. 9).

(7) Under s. 57 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1861 Bigamy. (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100), bigamy is punishable in England or Ireland, whether the bigamous marriage has taken place in England or Ireland or *elsewhere*, but the section does not

¹ Stephen, *History of the Criminal Law*, ii. 2.

extend to any second marriage contracted elsewhere than in England or Ireland by any other than a subject of His Majesty.

Foreign
Enlist-
ment Act.

(8) The Foreign Enlistment Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 90), is declared by s. 2 to extend to all the dominions of His Majesty, including the adjacent territorial waters, and some of its provisions, e.g. ss. 4, 7, extend to offences committed by any person being a British subject within or without His Majesty's dominions. The construction and operation of this Act were commented on in the case of *R. v. Jameson*, [1896] 2 Q. B. 425.

Classes of
British
subjects.

British subjects in the proper sense are of two classes:—

- (1) Natural-born British subjects; and
- (2) Naturalized British subjects.

Every person born within the King's dominions, whether of British or of foreign parents, is a natural-born British subject, unless he has renounced his British nationality in manner provided by s. 4 of the Naturalization Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 14).

Persons born out of the King's dominions whose fathers or grandfathers in the male line were natural-born British subjects are also by Act of Parliament¹ natural-born British subjects, subject to certain exceptions and qualifications, unless they have renounced their British nationality in manner provided by law.

Naturalized British subjects may have become so either by virtue of the imperial Naturalization Act of 1870, or by virtue of the law of a British possession. The rights of aliens naturalized under the imperial Act are not expressed by the Act to extend beyond the United Kingdom (s. 7). Naturalization by virtue of the law of a British possession does not operate beyond the limits of that possession. But it would seem that the holders of certificates of naturalization granted either under the imperial or under a colonial Act,

²⁵ Edw. III, stat. 2; 7 Anne, c. 5, s. 3; 4 Geo. II, c. 21; 13 Geo. III, c. 21.

are entitled to claim British protection in all foreign countries other than their country of origin¹.

The rights of an alien to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted under the Act of 1870 are subject to the qualification that he is not, when within the limits of the foreign State of which he was the subject previously to obtaining his certificate of naturalization, to be deemed to be a British subject, unless he has ceased to be a subject of that State in pursuance of the laws thereof, or of a treaty to that effect (33 & 34 Vict. c. 14, s. 7).

A child born abroad of a father or mother (being a widow) who has obtained a certificate of naturalization in the United Kingdom is, if during infancy he becomes resident with the parent in the United Kingdom, to be deemed a naturalized British subject (see 33 & 34 Vict. c. 34, s. 10 (5)).

In many of these cases there may be a double nationality. This is specially apt to occur in the case of the children or grandchildren, born abroad, of British subjects. The Acts which gave such persons the status of British subjects were passed for a special purpose, are apt to cause conflicts of law, and are not always suitable to Oriental circumstances. Enactments of this kind ought, it may reasonably be argued, to be construed *secundum materiam*. It appears to have been held at one time that the expression 'natural-born subjects' is, in the statutes affecting India, always taken to mean European British subjects², and, although this position can no longer be maintained in its entirety (see e.g. 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 32), there is ground for argument that it may be construed subject to restrictions in its application to descendants of non-European subjects of the Crown.

¹ For a discussion of the difficult questions which have been raised as to the effect of the statutory provisions under which certificates of naturalization are granted, and particularly as to the construction of s. 7 of the Naturalization Act, 1870, see the Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on the Naturalization Laws, 1901; Cd. 723. Naturalization of aliens in India is provided for by Act XXX of 1852, which must be read with reference to the later imperial Act of 1870.

² See Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 97.

Conclusions as to Parliamentary legislation for extra-territorial offences.

The conclusions to be drawn from the enactments and the reported decisions appear to be.

- (1) It would not be consistent with the principles of international law regulating the relations between independent civilized States ¹ for English courts to exercise, or for Parliament to confer, jurisdiction in respect of offences committed by foreigners in foreign territory. 'I am not aware,' says the late Mr. Justice Stephen, 'of any exception to the rule that crimes committed on land by foreigners out of the United Kingdom are not subject to the criminal law of England, except one furnished by the Merchant Shipping Act of 1854 (17 & 18 Vict. c. 104, s. 267). There may be exceptions in the orders made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts ².'
- (2) English courts are unwilling to exercise, and Parliament is unwilling to confer, jurisdiction in respect of offences committed by British subjects in foreign territory, except in special classes of cases.

With respect to offences committed in British territory and abetted in foreign territory, or vice versa, it is difficult to lay down any general proposition which does not require numerous qualifications.

In the case of felonies committed in England or Ireland and aided in foreign territory, the law is settled by the Accessories and Abettors Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 94, s. 7), which enacts that where any felony has been completely committed in England or Ireland, the offence of any person who has been an accessory, either before or after the fact, to the felony, may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined, and punished by any court which has jurisdiction to try the principal felony, or any felonies committed in any

¹ But see the qualifying note above, p. 313.

² *History of the Criminal Law*, ii. 12. Section 267 of the Act of 1854 is now represented by s. 687 of the Act of 1893 noticed above. As to the orders under the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts, see below, p. 353. There may also be an exception in the case of a breach of duty to the Crown committed abroad by a foreign servant of the Crown.

county or place in which the act by reason whereof that person has become accessory has been committed; and in any other case the offence of an accessory to a felony may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined, and punished by any court which has jurisdiction to try the principal felony or any felonies committed in any county or place in which the person being accessory is apprehended, or is in custody, whether the principal felony has been committed on the sea or on the land, or begun on the sea or completed on the land, or begun on the land or completed on the sea, and whether within His Majesty's dominions, or without, or partly within His Majesty's dominions, and partly without. But there is no similar comprehensive enactment with respect to misdemeanours, and it is obvious that different considerations would apply in the case of such breaches of statutory regulations as are not necessarily offences by the law of another country.

As to offences committed in foreign territory and instigated or aided in England, questions of great importance and delicacy have arisen. These questions were raised in the famous case of *R. v. Bernard*¹, and are touched on by the late Mr. Justice Stephen in his *History of Criminal Law*. His conclusion is that, 'whatever may be the merits of the case legally, it seems to be clear that the legislature ought to remove all doubt about it by putting crimes committed abroad on the same footing as crimes committed in England, as regards incitement, conspiracy, and accessories in England. Exceptions might be made as to political offences, though I should be sorry if they were made wide².' The English legislature has, however, never gone so far as to adopt these conclusions in general terms, though it has declared the law in particular cases. Thus, with respect to murder and manslaughter, the Offences against the Person Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, ss. 4, 9), has enacted in substance that persons who conspire in England to murder foreigners abroad,

¹ *Foster and Finlason*, 240 (1858); 8 *State Trials* (N. S.) 887.

² Vol. ii. p. 14.

or in England incite people to commit murder abroad, or become in England accessories, whether before or after the fact, to murder or manslaughter committed abroad, shall be in the same position in every respect as if the crime committed abroad had been committed in England.

As to theft, it was decided in 1861¹, on a question which arose under an Act of 1827 (7 & 8 Geo. IV, c. 29), that where goods are stolen abroad, e. g. in Guernsey, there could not be a conviction for receiving the goods in England, and this decision was considered applicable to cases under the Larceny Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 96), by which the Act of 1827 was replaced. This loophole in the criminal law has now been stopped by the Larceny Act, 1896 (59 & 60 Vict. c. 52), which punishes receipt in the United Kingdom of property stolen outside the United Kingdom. A similar question arose at Bombay in 1881² on the construction of ss. 410 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code; and it was held by the majority of the Court that certain bills of exchange stolen at Mauritius, where the Indian Penal Code was not in force, could not be regarded as stolen property within the meaning of s. 410 so as to make the person receiving them at Bombay liable under s. 411. In order to meet this decision, Act VIII of 1882 amended the definition of stolen property in s. 410 of the Penal Code by adding the words 'whether the transfer has been made, or the misappropriation or breach of trust has been committed, within or without British India.' The arguments and judgements in the Bombay case deserve study with reference not merely to the existing state of the law, but to the principles on which legislation should proceed. Legislation with respect to offences committed in foreign territory and instigated or aided in British territory will require careful consideration, especially in its application to foreigners, and with reference to minor offences, which may be innocent acts under the foreign law.

¹ *Reg. v. Debruick*, 11 Cox C. C. 207.

² *Empress v. S. Moorga Chetty*, I. L. R. 5 Bom. 338.

Under the Orders in Council made in pursuance of the successive Foreign Jurisdiction Acts British courts have been established and British jurisdiction is exercised in numerous foreign territories in respect not only of British subjects, but of foreigners, i. e. in cases to which Parliamentary legislation would not ordinarily extend. But this jurisdiction, though recognized, confirmed, supported, and regulated by Acts of Parliament, derives its authority ultimately, not from Parliament, but from powers inherent in the Crown or conceded to the Crown by a foreign State¹.

The jurisdiction arose historically out of the arrangements which have been made at various times between the Western Powers and the rulers of Constantinople. These arrangements date from a period long before the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. As far back as the ninth and tenth centuries the Greek Emperors of Constantinople granted to the Warings or Varangians from Scandinavia capitulations or rights of extra-territoriality, which gave them permission to own wharves, carry on trade, and govern themselves in the Eastern capital. The Venetians obtained similar capitulations in the eleventh century, the Amalfians in 1056, the Genoese in 1098, and the Pisans in 1110, and thenceforward they became extremely general. When the Turks took Constantinople they did little to interfere with the existing order of things, and the Genoese and Venetian capitulations were renewed². The first of what may be called the modern capitulations was embodied in the Treaty of February, 1535, between Francis I of France and Soliman the Magnificent.

¹ The first and most important section of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 37), is in form a declaration as well as an enactment. Section 2 is in form an enactment only, and possibly the difference was intentional.

² See the Introduction by J. Theodore Bent to *Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*, pp. ii, iii—Publications of the Hakluyt Society. Mr. Rashdall has drawn an interesting parallel between the self-governing communities of foreign merchants in Oriental countries and the self-governing communities of foreign students which, at Bologna and elsewhere, were eventually developed into Universities (*Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 153). As to the jurisdiction over students at Bologna, see *ibid.* pp. 178 sqq.

This treaty, although, as has been seen, it embodied no new principle, yet from another point of view marked a new and important departure in international law, if and so far as international law can be said to have existed at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The modern capitulations negatived the theory that the 'infidel' was the natural and necessary enemy of a Christian State, and admitted the Mahomedan State of Turkey for limited purposes into the family of European Christian States. At the same time they recognized the broad differences between Christian and Mahomedan institutions, habits, and feelings by insisting on the withdrawal from the jurisdiction of the local courts of Christian foreigners who resorted to Turkish territory for the purposes of trade, and by establishing officers and courts with jurisdiction over disputes between such foreigners.

The principles on which separate laws and a separate jurisdiction have been at times different and in different countries claimed on behalf of Western foreigners trading to the East were enunciated, many generations afterwards, by Lord Stowell in a passage which has become classical :—

'It is contended on this point that the King of Great Britain does not hold the British possessions in the East Indies in right of sovereignty, and therefore that the character of British merchants does not necessarily attach on foreigners locally resident there. But taking it that such a paramount sovereignty on the part of the Mogul princes really and solidly exists, and that Great Britain cannot be deemed to possess a sovereign right there ; still it is to be remembered that wherever even a mere factory is founded in the eastern parts of the world, European persons trading under the shelter and protection of those establishments are conceived to take their national character from that association under which they live and carry on their commerce. It is a rule of the law of nations, applying practically to those countries, and is different from what prevails ordinarily in Europe and the western parts of the world, in which men take their present national character from the general character of the country in which they are resident. And this distinction arises from the nature and habit of the countries. In the western parts of the world alien merchants mix in the society of the natives ; access and intermixture are permitted ; and they become incorporated to almost the full extent. But in the East, from the oldest times, an immiscible character has been kept up ; foreigners are not admitted into the general body and mass of the society of the nation ;

after three years' notice on proof of injury to the nation. The provisions of this charter do not, except with regard to its duration, differ in any material respect from those of the charter of Elizabeth.

Beginning of martial law exercisable by Company. It has been seen that under the charter of Elizabeth the Company had power to make laws and ordinances for the government of factors, masters, mariners, and other officers employed on their voyages, and to punish offenders by fine or imprisonment. This power, was, however, insufficient for the punishment of grosser offences and for the maintenance of discipline on long voyages. Accordingly, the Company were in the habit of procuring for each voyage a commission to the 'general' in command, empowering him to inflict punishments for non-capital offences, such as murder or mutiny, and to put in execution 'our law called martial'.¹

Grant of 1615. This course was followed until 1615, when, by a Royal grant of December 16, the power of issuing commissions embodying this authority was given to the Company, subject to a proviso requiring the verdict of a jury in the case of capital offences.

Grant of 1623. By 1623 the increase in the number of the Company's settlements, and the disorderliness of their servants, had drawn attention to the need for further coercive powers. Accordingly King James I, by a grant of February 14, 1623², gave the Company the power of issuing similar commissions to their presidents and other chief officers, authorizing them to punish in like manner offences committed by the Company's servants on land, subject to the like proviso as to the submission of capital cases to the verdict of a jury.

¹ For an example of a sentence of capital punishment under one of these commissions, see Kaye, *Administration of East India Company*, p. 66. In transactions with natives the Company's servants were nominally subject to the native courts. Rights of extra-mural jurisdiction had not yet been claimed.

² The double date here and elsewhere indicates a reference to the three months, January, February, March, which according to the Old Style closed the old year, while under the New Style, introduced in 1751 by the Act 24 Geo. II, c. 23, they begin the new year.

TABLE OF DATES

xxiii

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1802. Treaty of Amiens. Cape restored to Dutch.	1802. Treaty of Bassein and restoration of Peshwá.
1803 (May). War declared between England and France.	1803. League of Sindia and Nagpur Raja (Maráthás). Maráthá War (Battles of Assaye, Argaum, Laswaree).
1804. Pitt's second ministry. Napoleon, Emperor.	1804. Gáekwar of Baroda submits to subsidiary system.
1805 (October 21). Battle of Trafalgar.—Capitulation of Ulm. (December 2.) Battle of Austerlitz.	1805 (July to October). Lord Cornwallis again Governor-General. —Succeeded by Sir George Barlow (till 1807).
1806 (January 23). Death of William Pitt.—Ministry of 'All the Talents.'—Lord Grenville, Prime Minister. Berlin Decrees issued, and Orders in Council issued in reply.	1806. Mutiny of Sepoys at Vellore.
1807. Duke of Portland, Prime Minister.	1807. War with Travancore.
1808-14. Peninsular War.	1807-13. Lord Minto, Governor-General.
1809. Walcheren expedition.—Battle of Wagram. Perceval, Prime Minister. English occupy the Cape.	1809. Travancore subdued.
1810. Mauritius taken from French.	
1812. Napoleon invades Russia. War between England and United States. (June.) Lord Liverpool, Prime Minister (till 1827). (July.) Battle of Salamanca.	
1813 (June). Battle of Vittoria. (October 16-19.) Battle of Leipzig.	1813. Charter Act of 1813 (55 Geo. III, c. 155). East India Company loses monopoly of Indian trade.
1814. First Peace of Paris.—Napoleon abdicates. Cape ceded to England.	1813-23. Lord Hastings, Governor-General.
1815 (February). Napoleon returns from Elba. (June 18.) Battle of Waterloo (November.) Second Peace of Paris.	1814-15. Gúrkha War.
1820. George IV. Congress at Troppau, afterwards at Laybach.	1815. Kumaon ceded. 1817. Pindáris conquered. 1817-18. Third Maráthá War, ending in annexation of Poona and reduction of Holkar and Rajputana. 1819. Wazir of Oudh assumes title of King.

they continue strangers and sojourners as their fathers were—*Doris amara suam non intermiscuit undam*. Not acquiring any national character under the general sovereignty of the country, and not trading under any recognized authority of their own original country, they have been held to derive their present character from that of the association or factory under whose protection they live and carry on their trade ¹.

The first of the capitulations granted to England bears ^{The} date in the year 1579 ², and two years afterwards, in 1581, ^{Levant} Queen Elizabeth established the Company for the purpose of carrying on trade with the countries under the Ottoman Porte. In 1605 the company obtained a new charter from James I, and this charter, as confirmed by Charles II, recognized by various Acts of Parliament, and supplemented by usage, constituted the basis of the British consular jurisdiction in the East until the abolition of the Levant Company in 1825 ³.

By the charter of King James, as confirmed by the charter of King Charles, the company was invested with exclusive privileges of trade in great part of the Levant and Mediterranean seas, and with a general power of making by-laws and appointing consuls with judicial functions in all the regions so designated.

The charter of King James was altogether in the nature of a prerogative grant from home, and was not founded on

¹ *The Indian Chief*, (1800) 3 Robinson, Adm. Rep. p. 28. See also the remarks of Dr. Lushington in the case of the *Laconia*, (1863) 2 Moo. P. C., N. S., p. 183.

² The capitulations with England now in force were confirmed by the Treaty of the Dardanelles in 1809, and are to be found in Hertslet's *Treaties*, ii. 346, and in Aitchison's *Treaties*, third edition, vol. xi. Appendix I.

³ The statements in the following paragraphs, as to the jurisdiction exercised by the officers of the Levant Company, are derived partly from a memorandum written for the Foreign Office by the late Mr. Hope Scott (then Mr. J. R. Hope), by whom the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1843, was drawn. [This memorandum, which at the date of the first edition of this book had not been published, is now printed as Appendix VI to Sir Henry Jenkyns' *British Rule and Jurisdiction beyond the Seas*.] See also the case of *The Laconia*; *Papayanni v. The Russian Steam Navigation Company*, 2 Moo. P. C., N. S., 161. As to the history of the Levant Company, see Mr. Bent's *Introduction to Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant*, noticed above, and the article on 'Chartered Companies' in the *Encyclopaedia of the Levant of England*.

any recital of concessions made by the various sovereigns in whose dominions it was to take effect. It did not expressly refer to any such concessions as the basis of a power to withdraw British subjects from the foreign tribunals, and such a power was apparently assumed even in cases in which those tribunals might, according to the local law, supply the legitimate forum. The charter merely provided that there should be no infraction of treaties.

The main strength of the coercive jurisdiction given by the charter appears, in Turkey at least, to have depended, on the one hand, upon the corporate character of the company and the power which it thus had over its own members, and, on the other hand, upon its exclusive privileges of trade which enabled it to prevent the influx of disorderly merchants and seamen.

The charter did not contemplate the exercise of any criminal jurisdiction properly so called, nor any of a civil character in mixed suits. These branches of the consular jurisdiction in the East are probably of gradual acquisition, and perhaps were not claimed at the time when King James and King Charles granted their charters.

Dissolu-
tion of
Levant
Company.

The jurisdiction conceded by the Sublime Porte was exercised mainly¹ by officers called consuls², who were appointed by the Levant Company, and whose procedure was regulated by by-laws of the Company made under powers very like those granted to the East India Company.

The Levant Company, with its exclusive privileges of trading and its indefinite legislative and judicial powers, closely resembled the East India Company; and the legal

¹ The jurisdiction was exercised also by the ambassador, who was appointed by the Crown, but was until 1803 nominated and paid by the Levant Company. He continued to be chief judge of the consular court down to 1857.

² Of course the use of the word 'consul' is of much older date; see Murray's Dictionary, and Du Cange, s. v., and the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Consular Establishments, 1835. As to the French consuls in the Levant during and before the seventeenth century, see Masson, *Hist. du Commerce Français dans le Levant*, p. xiv.

difficulties which arose when the East India Company extended the exercise of its legislative powers beyond the staff of its factories illustrate the technical difficulties which arose or might have arisen under the jurisdiction exercised by the consular officers of the Levant Company. But, as the East India Company grew, the Levant Company dwindled, and in 1825 it was formally dissolved. The Act which provided for its dissolution (6 Geo. IV. c. 33) enacted that thereafter all such rights and duties of jurisdiction and authority over His Majesty's subjects resorting to the ports of the Levant for the purposes of trade or otherwise as were lawfully exercised or performed, or which the various charters or Acts, or any of them, authorized to be exercised and performed, by any consuls or other officers appointed by the company, or which such consuls or other officers lawfully exercised and performed under and by virtue of any power or authority whatever, should be vested in and exercised and performed by such consuls and other officers as His Majesty might be pleased to appoint for the protection of the trade of His Majesty's subjects in the ports and places mentioned in the charters and Acts.

The intention of the Act, doubtless, was to transfer to the consular officers appointed by the Crown all the powers formerly vested in the consular officers appointed by the Levant Company. But it soon appeared that the dissolution of the company materially increased the difficulty of the task imposed on the consuls. The authority which had previously supported them was gone, and the prescriptive respect which might formerly have attached to the powers conferred by the charter was disturbed by the necessity which had now arisen of testing those powers by the recognized principles of the English constitution.

In 1826 the law officers of the Crown threw doubts on the legality of the general powers of fine and imprisonment, and of the power which had previously been held to be vested in the consuls of sending back British subjects in certain

Difficulties arising from dissolution of Levant Company.

cases to this country, and thus the coercive character of the jurisdiction was greatly shaken.

Moreover, the Act of George IV had made no provision in lieu of the company's power of framing by-laws, and no method had been devised for meeting the difficulties arising out of a strict adherence to English jurisprudence and out of deviations from it by the consular tribunals.

And, lastly, the criminal and international jurisdiction had gradually assumed a form which the new state of affairs rendered in the highest degree important, but the exercise of which transcended such authority as the company's consuls might previously have claimed.

In 1836, eleven years after the dissolution of the Levant Company, an Act (6 & 7 Will. IV, c. 78) was passed to meet these difficulties. It recited that by the treaties and capitulations subsisting between His Majesty and the Sublime Porte full and entire jurisdiction and control over British subjects within the Ottoman dominions in matters in which such British subjects are exclusively concerned was given to the British ambassadors and consuls appointed to reside within the said dominions, and that it was expedient for the protection of British subjects within the dominions of the Sublime Porte in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and likewise in the States of Barbary, as well as for the protection of His Majesty's ambassadors, consuls, or other officers appointed or to be appointed by His Majesty for the protection of the trade of His Majesty's subjects in the said ports and places, that provision should be made for defining and establishing the authority of the said ambassadors, consuls, or other officers. And it went on to enact that His Majesty might by Orders in Council issue directions to His Majesty's consuls and other officers touching their rights and duties in the protection of his subjects residing in or resorting to the ports and places mentioned, and also directions for their guidance in the settlement of differences between subjects of His Majesty and subjects of any other Christian Power in the dominions of the Sublime Porte.

The Act of 1836 was a complete failure, and remained a dead letter. Its language and machinery were in many respects defective and open to objection.

British extra-territorial jurisdiction in the Levant was derived from two main sources : the authority of the Sublime Porte and the authority of the Crown of England. The charters of James and Charles ignored one of these sources, and used language which seemed to treat the jurisdiction exercised by the consular officers of the Levant Company as resting exclusively on the prerogative of the Crown. The language of the Act of 1825 was sufficiently general to include, and was perhaps intended to include, authority derived from the Porte and from the consent of other European Powers, but the Act makes no specific reference to either of these sources. The Act of 1836 erred in the opposite direction. Its language was so framed as to countenance the theory, always disavowed by the English Government, that British ambassadors and consuls were in respect of their jurisdiction delegates of the Porte, instead of being officers of the Crown exercising powers conceded to the Crown by the Porte.

Failure of
Act of
1836; its
causes.

Again, the preamble, by referring specifically to the capitulations, and to cases in which British subjects were exclusively concerned, tended to discredit those important parts of the jurisdiction which had arisen from usage or which related to cases affecting foreign subjects under the protection of Great Britain.

Usage had played an important part in the development of British jurisdiction in the Levant. At the outset that jurisdiction, as has been seen, did not include criminal jurisdiction, properly so called, nor civil jurisdiction in suits of a mixed character. But by 1836 the subject-matter of this jurisdiction appears¹ to have included, either generally and constantly or in some places and occasionally—

- (1) Crimes and offences of whatever kind committed by British subjects ;
- (2) Civil proceedings where all parties were British subjects ;

¹ According to Mr. Hope Scott.

(3) Civil proceedings where the defendant was a British subject and the plaintiff a subject of the Porte; and

(4) Civil proceedings where the defendant was a British subject and the plaintiff subject to another European Power.

And the exercise of this jurisdiction might be claimed, not only on behalf of British subjects, but equally on behalf of subjects of other Powers navigating under the flag, or claiming the protection, of Great Britain. It must be borne in mind that the Ionian Islands were at that time under the protection of the British Government, and that cases in which Ionian islanders were concerned were apt to come before the consular courts at Constantinople and elsewhere in the Levant. But, besides the Ionian islanders, there was a motley crew of persons of different nationalities, hangers-on of the embassy and others, who for reasons more or less legitimate claimed British protection. This was the origin of the class of protected persons referred to in modern Orders in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts ¹.

Lastly, the Act was so vaguely worded as to leave great room for doubt as to the powers conferred by it on the Crown, and particularly as to how far the Crown could in accordance with it exercise powers of legislation. This was a matter of the greatest moment. Under the capitulations the 'custom' of the English was to be observed on the decision of any suit or other difference or dispute amongst the English themselves. And in proceedings between English and Europeans the *forum rei* was customarily allowed to entail the application of English law to an English defendant, but a strict adherence to English jurisprudence had never been observed. The law to be administered was so vague and uncertain that a power to declare and modify it had become imperatively necessary.

The Act of 1836 was repealed and superseded by the Foreign Jurisdiction Act of 1843 (6 & 7 Vict. c. 94). This

Foreign
Jurisdiction
Act
of 1843.

¹ It is well known how scandalously the privilege of claiming foreign protection has been abused in places like Tangier. As to the restrictions placed on this privilege in Turkey see Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, ii. 230.

Act, the provisions of which are now embodied in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 37), was as conspicuous a success as its predecessor was a conspicuous failure. Its merits were that its recitals were sufficiently comprehensive to cover all possible sources of extra-territorial jurisdiction, and that its enacting words embodied a formula of great simplicity, and yet sufficiently elastic to cover all modes in which extra-territorial jurisdiction need be exercised. The theory on which the Act proceeded was that, in places beyond the Queen's dominions where the Queen had jurisdiction, she ought, with respect to the persons under that jurisdiction, to be in the same position as that which she occupies in a territory acquired by conquest or cession, that is to say, ought to have full power of legislating by Order in Council. The Act recited (as the Act of 1890 now recites) that by treaty, capitulation, grant, usage, sufferance, and other lawful means Her Majesty hath power and jurisdiction within divers countries and places out of Her Majesty's dominions, and that doubts have arisen how far the exercise of such power and jurisdiction is controlled by and dependent on the law and customs of this realm, and it is expedient that such doubts should be removed. It then declared and enacted, in terms reproduced by the Act of 1890, that 'it is and shall be lawful for Her Majesty to hold, exercise, and enjoy any power or jurisdiction which Her Majesty now hath, or may at any time hereafter have, within any country or place out of Her Majesty's dominions in the same and as ample a manner as if Her Majesty had acquired such power or jurisdiction by the cession or conquest of territory.'

To illustrate the effect of this enactment by a concrete instance, the King has, with respect to the jurisdiction exercisable by him at Shanghai, a place within the territorial limits of the empire of China, the same power as he has in Hong Kong, a British Crown colony outside the territorial limits of China and acquired by cession.

Under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act of 1843, and the various

Law framed and administered under Foreign Jurisdiction Acts.

enactments which have been passed for amending and extending it, and which are now embodied in the Consolidation Act of 1890, consular and other judicial officers have been established in all parts of the world where the sovereign Power is non-Christian, and extensive codes of law have been framed for their guidance¹. In most cases the law adopted has been the English law, with the necessary modifications and simplifications; but at Zanzibar, which is much resorted to by natives of India, and from officers at which place an appeal is given to the High Court of Bombay, the law applied is the law of British India². A similar course was adopted in the Persian Coast and Islands Order in Council, 1889³.

Three stages in history of Acts. First stage: application to States under regular Governments.

Three stages may be traced in the history of the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts.

During the first stage they were applied exclusively to territories under regular Governments to whom consular officers were accredited, and where consular jurisdiction was exercised concurrently by the officers of other European States. Practically they were only applied to non-Christian countries, such as Turkey, Persia, and China. 'Such countries,' as Mr. Westlake has observed⁴, 'have civilizations differing from European, and, so far as they are not Mahomedan, from those of one another. The Europeans or Americans in them form classes apart, and would not feel safe under the local administration of justice which, even were they assured of its integrity, could not have the machinery necessary for giving adequate protection to the unfamiliar interests arising out of a foreign civilization. They were therefore placed under the jurisdiction of the consuls of their respective States, pursuant to conventions entered into by the latter with the local Governments.'

Turkey was the first country to which the Foreign Juris-

¹ See the Orders in Council printed in vol. v of the *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*.

² See the Zanzibar Order in Council, 1897. *Stat. R. and O. Rev.* v. 87.

³ *Stat. R. and O. Rev.* v. 667.

⁴ *Chapters on Principles of International Law*, p. 102.

diction Acts were applied, and the jurisdiction exercised by British authorities in Turkey is now regulated by the Ottoman Order in Council, 1899¹, which extends to all the dominions of the Ottoman Porte, including Egypt.

The Anglo-French Convention of 1904 virtually recognized the predominant position of the British Government in Egypt, but Egypt has not become a British protectorate, as Tunis has become a French protectorate, and consequently Egypt is still subject to the régime of the Capitulations. The evils arising out of that régime have been forcibly described by Lord Cromer in his reports on Egypt for the years 1904 and 1905². Egypt, he remarks, stands in the unique position of an oriental country which has assimilated a very considerable portion of European civilization, and which is mainly governed by European methods, but which at the same time possesses no machinery for general legislation, such as is possessed by the various states which, in judicial and administrative matters, it is taking as its model. At present no change can be made in any law applicable to Europeans without the unanimous consent of nearly all the Powers of Europe and the United States of America, and experience shows that it is practically impossible to obtain this consent even in matters of minor importance. So long as legislation is conducted by diplomacy, and so long as fifteen separate powers each possess the right of *liberum veto* on each new legislative proposal, he regards any attempt to introduce the reforms, of which the country stands so much in need, as practically hopeless. The remedy which he suggests is the creation of a special legislative body, representative of European foreigners in Egypt, and capable of making laws to bind them³.

¹ *Stat. R. and O. Rev.* vol. v. p. 742. When Tunis became a French protectorate it was excluded from the operation of the Ottoman Order in Council then in force. As to the consular courts and jurisdiction in Turkey see Young, *Corps de Droit Ottoman*, i. 279.

² Egypt, No. 1 (1905), Cd. 2409; Egypt, No. 1 (1906), Cd. 2817.

³ The capitulations do not apply to the Soudan, which is practically a British protectorate.

Second
stage :
applica-
tion to
barbarous
countries.

After the Foreign Jurisdiction Act had been applied to countries like Turkey, it became necessary to extend the system of foreign jurisdiction to barbarous countries not under any settled government. By an Act of 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 31)¹ the colonial authorities of Sierra Leone were empowered to exercise jurisdiction in the uncivilized territories adjoining that colony. And by an Act of 1863 (26 & 27 Vict. c. 35)¹ similar provision was made with respect to territories adjoining the Cape Colony. A more important departure in this stage was marked by the passing of the Pacific Islanders Protection Act of 1875 (38 & 39 Vict. c. 51). By this Act Her Majesty was empowered to create by Order in Council a court of justice with civil, criminal, and admiralty jurisdiction over Her Majesty's subjects within certain islands and places in the Western Pacific, with power to take cognizance of all crimes and offences committed by Her Majesty's subjects within any of those islands and places. Three years later power was given in more general terms to bring places not within the dominions of any settled government under the operation of the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts. By s. 5 of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1878 (41 & 42 Vict. c. 67), now reproduced by s. 2 of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890, it was enacted that in any country or place out of Her Majesty's dominions in or to which any of Her Majesty's subjects were for the time being resident or resorting, and which was not subject to any Government from whom Her Majesty might obtain power and jurisdiction by treaty, or any of the other means mentioned in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1843, Her Majesty should, by virtue of the Act, have power and jurisdiction over Her Majesty's subjects² for the time being resident in or resorting to that country or place, and the same should be deemed to be power and jurisdiction

¹ This Act is still in force, but may be revoked or varied by an Order in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890 (see 53 and 54 Vict. c. 37, s. 17).

² Note that the jurisdiction under these enactments is expressly confined to British subjects.

The history of the Company during the reigns of the first two Stuarts and the period of the Commonwealth is mainly occupied with their contests with Dutch competitors and English rivals.

Contests
with
Dutch and
English
rivals.

The massacre of Amboyna (February 16, 1623) is the turning-point in the rivalry with the Dutch. On the one hand it enlisted the patriotic sympathies of Englishmen at home on behalf of their countrymen in the East. On the other hand it compelled the Company to retire from the Eastern Archipelago, and concentrate their efforts on the peninsula of India.

Massacre
of Am-
boyna.

Under Charles I the extensive trading privileges of the Company were seriously limited. Sir William Courten, through the influence of Endymion Porter, a gentleman of the bedchamber, obtained from the king a licence to trade to the East Indies independently of the East India Company. His association, which, from a settlement established by it at Assada, in Madagascar, was often spoken of as the Assada Company, was a thorn in the side of the East India Company for many years.

Courten's
Associa-
tion.

Under the Commonwealth the intervention of the Protector was obtained for the settlement of the Company's differences both with their Dutch and with their English competitors. By the Treaty of Westminster in 1654, Cromwell obtained from the Dutch payment of a sum of £85,000 as compensation for the massacre of Amboyna and for the exclusion of the Company from trade with the Spice Islands. Difficulties arose, however, as to the apportionment of this sum among the several joint stocks of which the Company's capital was then composed, and, pending their settlement, Cromwell borrowed £50,000 of the sum for the expenses of the State. He thus anticipated the policy subsequently adopted by Montagu and his successors of compelling the Company to grant public loans as a price for their privileges.

Crom-
well's
relations
to the
Company.

Ultimately the Company obtained from Cromwell in 1657 a charter under which the rump of Courten's Association

Crom-
well's
charter of
1657.

had by Her Majesty therein within the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1843.

An important stage was reached when the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts were applied to protectorates. In territories to which the Pacific Islanders Protection Act applies, such as Samoa, British officers and French or German officers may be exercising jurisdiction side by side. But in their third stage the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts have been applied to certain territories in Africa which are under the exclusive protectorate of England in this sense, that their chiefs are debarred from entertaining diplomatic relations with any other European Power, and that consequently such extra-territorial jurisdiction as is exercised within the territories is monopolized by officers of the British Government instead of being exercised by them concurrently with officers of other European States.

The term 'protectorate' acquired international recognition in the proceedings of the Berlin Conference of 1885, when it was stipulated (by Art. 34 of the *Acte Général*) that any Power which might thereafter either acquire possession of or assume a protectorate over, any territory on the coast of Africa, should notify the same to the other signatory Powers, in order to give them an opportunity of putting forward any claim to which they might conceive themselves entitled. This stipulation did not apply to annexations or protectorates in the interior ¹.

Immediately after the signature of the general Act of Berlin, the Emperor William granted to the German Colonization Society in East Africa a charter of protection, in which he spoke of territories which by certain traders had been ceded to him for the German Colonization Society, with 'territorial superiority' ², and granted to the society, on

¹ The general Act of Berlin is to be found in Hertslet, *Map of Africa by Treaty*, i. 26. There are several references to protectorates in other articles of the Act of Berlin, and also in the subsequent Brussels Act with respect to the African Slave Trade, Hertslet, i. 48.

² The word used in the charter is 'Landeshoheit,' and is translated in Hertslet's *Map of Africa by Treaty* as 'sovereign rights.'

certain conditions, the authority to exercise all rights arising from their treaties, including that of jurisdiction over both the natives and the subjects of Germany and of other nations established in those territories, or sojourning there for commercial or other purposes¹.

Questions
as to effect
of German
charter.

As to the legal and international effects of this charter and of the later imperial Act of April, 1886, by which the charter has apparently been superseded, many questions have been raised by writers on international law both in this country and on the Continent². Have the territories to which they apply become German territory in a sense which imports all the rights and responsibilities of territorial sovereignty? Or are they merely subject to a German protectorate, implying a lesser degree of sovereignty and responsibility?

In considering these questions it must be borne in mind that Germany had in 1886 practically no colonial experience. England, with her vast system of colonies and dependencies, and with her factories and mercantile establishments in every part of the world, is familiar with the several distinctions for legislative, judicial, and executive purposes between the British dominions as a whole and the places outside the British dominions in which British jurisdiction is exercised; between the United Kingdom and the colonies and dependencies which, with the United Kingdom, make up the British Empire, and are sometimes described collectively in Acts of Parliament as British possessions; and lastly, between the several classes of British possessions; and with the mode in which, extent to which, and conditions under which imperial authority may be exercised in places belonging to each of these categories. Germany, when the present empire was formed, had no colonies, and few important mercantile settlements in foreign countries, and the constitution of the empire contained no provision for the mode in which authority was

¹ Hertslot, *Map of Africa by Treaty*, i. 393.

² See e.g. Hall, *Foreign Jurisdiction of the British Crown*, part iii. chap. 3; Westlake, *Chapters on the Principles of International Law*, p. 177; Despagnet, *Essai sur les Protectorats*, chap. iii.

to be exercised in any possessions or colonies which might subsequently be acquired. Hence the antithesis which was most present to the minds of German statesmen and jurists was that between their home or European territories—the *Reichsgebiet* proper—and their new acquisitions beyond the seas; and the tendency was to distinguish these latter by the collective name of protected territory, or '*Schützgebiet*.' It was not unnatural that this appellation should appear inconveniently indefinite, and that more precise information should have been desiderated as to the category in which these territories ought to be placed; as to whether they were or were not to be treated, for international purposes, as German territory; as to whether the natives were or were not German subjects; and generally as to the nature and extent of the rights claimed and responsibilities assumed by the German sovereign within these regions. African protectorates are still in a transitional and experimental stage, and it is not always easy to give a precise answer to questions of this kind. The German Protectorate in East Africa, with its double government by the Imperial Crown and by a chartered company, was a political experiment resembling in its nature, and perhaps consciously modelled on, the earlier form of British rule in India. The vagueness of language of the German charter and Act finds a close parallel in the vagueness of language of the English regulating Act of 1773, and this vagueness is probably attributable in each case to the same causes. As Sir James Stephen has remarked¹, the authors of the Regulating Act 'wished that the King of England should act as the sovereign of Bengal, but they did not wish to proclaim him to be so.'

The questions which were raised with reference to the German protectorate claimed in 1885 may be raised, and have been raised, with reference to the English protectorates established in various parts of Africa over regions occupied by uncivilized tribes. The term 'protectorate,' it has been

Ques
as to
English
protectorates in
Africa.

¹ *Nuncomar and Impey*, ii. 120.

observed, implies a protecting State and a protected State. How can it be applied to uncivilized regions where there is no organized State to protect? In what respects does a protectorate of this kind, where all the effective powers of sovereignty are exercised by the protecting State, differ from territorial sovereignty¹? The tenuity of the distinction between a protectorate of this kind and territorial sovereignty was well illustrated by the Jameson case of 1896.² In that case the expedition started from two points, one of which, Mafeking, was within the boundaries of the Cape Colony, and therefore clearly within British territory, whilst the other, Pitsani Pitslogo, was within the Bechuanaland Protectorate. The Lord Chief Justice, in charging the jury², intimated clearly that in his opinion the latter of these places, as well as the former, must, at all events for the purposes of the Act under which the indictment was framed (the Foreign Enlistment Act, 1870, 33 & 34 Vict. c. 90, s. 11), be treated as if it were within the limits of Her Majesty's dominions.

¹ The following are illustrative specimens of treaties made with native chiefs in Africa :—

‘[*name of chief*] hereby declares that he has placed himself and all his territories, countries, peoples, and subjects under the protection, rule, and government of the Imperial British East Africa Company, and has ceded to the said Company all its [*qu.* his] sovereign rights and rights of government over all his territories, countries, peoples, and subjects, in consideration of the said Company granting the protection of the said Company to him, his territories, countries, peoples, and subjects, and extending to them the benefit of the rule and government of the said Company. And he undertakes to hoist and recognize the flag of the said Company.’ Hertslet, *Map of Africa by Treaty*, i. 166.

‘We, the undersigned Sub-Chiefs, . . . acting for and on behalf of the Wanyassa people living within [specified limits], most earnestly beseech Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland . . . to take our country, ourselves, and our peoples under her special protection, we solemnly pledging and binding ourselves and our peoples to observe the following conditions :—

‘1. That we give, over all our country within the above-described limits, all sovereign rights, and all and every other claim absolutely, and without any reservation whatever, to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen [*&c.*] for all time coming.’ Hertslet, i. 188.

It is difficult to see what residuum of sovereignty remains after these cessions.

² *Times*, July 29, 1896.

And this might, perhaps, reasonably be held, for the nature of the sovereignty exercised by the British Crown within the protectorate was such that the British Crown and its agents and officers could, whilst a protected native chief could not, prevent an aggression from the protectorate into neighbouring territory, and consequently such an aggression was within the mischief of the Act¹. It must be remembered, however, that the points of law arising in the Jameson case were not fully argued, and that the language of a charge to the jury cannot always be construed with the same strictness as the language of a judgement. The law was laid down in the Jameson case with reference to the construction of a particular statute, and the propositions embodied in the chief justice's charge must not receive too wide an application. It seems clear that for ordinary purposes the territory of a protectorate is foreign and not British territory. If this were not so, orders for establishing and regulating the jurisdiction exercisable within it by British authorities could not be made under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act. Perhaps it would be accurate to say that for the purposes of municipal law the territory of the Bechuanaland Protectorate is not, but for the purposes of international law must be treated as if it were, part of the British dominions. The line of division is thin, but it exists, and it has its utility. If the objection is raised that protectorates of this kind are inconsistent with previously received rules and formulae of international law, the answer is that they have been found by practical experience to provide a convenient halfway house between complete annexation and complete abstinence from interference; that international law is an understanding between civilized nations with respect to the rules applicable to certain existing facts; that it is in a state of constant growth and development; and that when new facts make their appearance the appropriate rules and formulae will speedily be devised².

¹ See the Order in Council as to jurisdiction in the protectorate, below, p. 375.

² The terms 'protectorate' and 'sphere of influence' have sometimes

Persons
over
whom
consular
jurisdic-
tion is
exercis-
able.

The application to protectorates of the machinery of the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts has brought into greater prominence the question as to the classes of persons with respect to whom the jurisdiction exercised in accordance with those Acts can be or ought to be exercised. The answer to these questions depends upon the nature and origin of the jurisdiction, and on the terms of the instrument by which the jurisdiction is regulated. As the jurisdiction is derived from an arrangement between the British Crown and the territorial sovereign, it clearly can be made exercisable in the case of persons under either of those authorities. But in the territories where it was first exercised, it was required for the protection of foreigners, and was not intended for, and was not exercised in the case of, subjects of the territorial sovereign. The classes of persons for whom it was intended were either British subjects or persons entitled to the political protection of the British Crown. And the Ottoman Order in Council of 1899 (Articles 16-19), like other Orders in Council framed on the same lines, includes British-protected persons in its definition of British subjects (Art. 3) and orders provision for the registration of British subjects as so defined. In the

been loosely treated as synonymous. But the latter term has merely a negative meaning. It implies an engagement between two States, that one of them will abstain from interfering or exercising influence within certain territories, which, as between the contracting parties, are reserved for the operations of the other. Such an engagement does not of itself involve the exercise of any powers or the assumption of any responsibility by either State within the sphere of influence reserved to itself. But the exclusion of interference by one of the States within a particular territory may involve the assumption by the other of some degree of responsibility for the maintenance of order within that territory. Thus a sphere of influence is a possible protectorate, and tends to pass into a protectorate, just as a protectorate tends to pass into complete sovereignty. The chief use of establishing a sphere of influence appears to be to minimize the risk of war arising from scrambles for territory, and to obviate the necessity for effective occupation as a bar to annexation or encroachment by a competent State. But the arrangement on which a 'sphere of influence' is based has, of itself, no international validity, and is not binding except on such States as are parties to the arrangement. The phrase was invented to meet a transient state of things, and is perhaps tending to become obsolete.

case of the *Laconia*¹, which was between British subjects and Russian subjects in respect of a collision between a British and a Russian ship, it was found by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that the Ottoman Government had long acquiesced in allowing the British Government jurisdiction between British subjects and subjects of other Christian States exercised by means of consular courts, and that whilst there was no compulsory power in a British court in Turkey over any but British subjects, a Russian or other foreigner might voluntarily submit to the jurisdiction of such a court with the consent of his sovereign.

The decision in the *Laconia* case applied to a state of circumstances where there were several Powers exercising extra-territorial jurisdiction in the territories of the same State. It requires modification in its application to the conditions of a protectorate. The assumption of control over the foreign relations, or, to use another expression, over the external sovereignty, of a State implies the assumption of responsibility both for the safety and for the good conduct of foreigners who resort to the territories of the protected State and who are not subjects of the protecting State; that is to say, for matters which, in the case of an independent State, are dealt with by diplomatic intervention. And, except where the local law and administration of justice are in full conformity with European standards, this responsibility cannot be effectively discharged unless the courts of the protecting State exercise jurisdiction over such foreigners.

Consequences of establishment of protectorate.

Conversely, when the protecting State establishes courts with competent jurisdiction and adequate security for the administration of justice in accordance with Western ideas, the necessity for consular courts of other Western Powers disappears. Thus, when France established a protectorate over the regency of Tunis and set up French courts in the regency, the Queen consented to abandon her consular jurisdiction, with a view to British subjects in the regency becoming

¹ (1863) 2 Moo. P. C., N. S., 161; 33 Law Journal, N. S., P. M. & A. 11.

ing justiciable by those French courts under the same conditions as French subjects¹.

Accordingly, the assumption of an exclusive protectorate seems to imply the exercise of jurisdiction over foreigners and the exclusion of the jurisdiction of foreign consular courts, and in the opinion of the latest authorities on international law jurisdiction over foreigners is, in such protectorates, legally exercisable under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act².

Jurisdiction in African protectorates.

The mode in which the powers exercisable under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act have been applied to uncivilized regions, and have been gradually extended in their adaptation to protectorates, may be illustrated by the Orders in Council which have at various times been made for different regions in Africa.

A comparatively early stage in the process of development is represented by an Order of 1889³ under which 'local jurisdictions' could be constituted where necessary. The Order declared that the powers conferred by it within a local jurisdiction was to extend to the persons and matters following, in so far as by treaty, grant, usage, sufferance, or other lawful means Her Majesty had power or authority in relation to such persons and matters, that is to say :—

- (1) British subjects as defined by the Order ;
- (2) The property and personal and proprietary rights and obligations of British subjects within the local jurisdiction (whether such subjects were or were not within the jurisdiction), including British ships with their boats and the persons and property on board thereof, or belonging thereto ;
- (3) Foreigners, as defined by the Order, who should submit

¹ The British consular jurisdiction established in Tunis under the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts was expressly abolished by the Order in Council of December 31, 1883.

² See e. g. Westlake, p. 187.

³ The Africa Order in Council, 1889. *Stat. R. and O. Rev.*, vol. v. p. 1. This Order and the amending Order of 1892 have been practically superseded by the Orders of 1902 for British Central Africa and British East Africa.

themselves to a court, in accordance with the provisions of the Order ;

- (4) Foreigners, as defined by the Order, with respect to whom any State, king, chief, or Government, whose subjects, or under whose protection they are, had, by any treaty, as defined by the Order, or otherwise, agreed with Her Majesty for, or consented to, the exercise of power or authority by Her Majesty.

The term ' British subject ' was defined as including not only British subjects in the proper sense of the word, but also any persons enjoying Her Majesty's protection and, in particular, subjects of the several princes and States in India in alliance with Her Majesty, residing and being in the parts of Africa mentioned in the Order¹. The term ' foreigner ' was defined as meaning a person, whether a native or subject of Africa or not, who was not a British subject within the meaning of the Order.

Whether the Order authorized the exercise of criminal jurisdiction over ' foreigners ' seems open to doubt, and the exercise under it of civil jurisdiction in respect of a ' foreigner ' was expressly declared to require his specific consent in each case, whilst the court was also empowered to require evidence that no objection was made by the Government whose subject the foreigner was.

These restrictions on the exercise of jurisdiction over foreigners were soon found to be incompatible with the conditions of a protectorate, and accordingly the jurisdiction received a wide extension under the Africa Order in Council, 1892. This Order, after reciting in the usual terms that, by treaty, grant, usage, sufferance, and other lawful means, Her Majesty the Queen had power and jurisdiction in the parts of Africa mentioned in the Order of 1889, went on to recite that—

• This language is in accordance with the terms of the enactment which is reproduced by s. 15 of the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890, and which was passed before the Interpretation Act, 1889.

'By the general Act of the Conference of Berlin signed in 1885 the several Powers who were parties thereto (in this Order referred to as the Signatory Powers) declared, with respect to occupations in Africa by any of the Signatory Powers, that the establishment of authority in protected territories was an obligation resting upon the respective protecting Powers; and that, in order to the due fulfilment of the said obligations, as respects territories and places within the limits of the Order of 1889, which Her Majesty should have declared to be under the protection of Her Majesty, it was necessary that the subjects of the Signatory Powers, other than Her Majesty, should be justiciable under that order in like manner as British subjects, and that for this purpose the provisions of the Order referring to British subjects should, as far as practicable, be extended to the subjects of those Powers.'

It then proceeded to enact that—

'Where Her Majesty has declared any territory or place within the limits of the Africa Order in Council, 1889, to be a protectorate of Her Majesty, the provisions of that Order having reference to British subjects, except Part XIV thereof¹, shall extend in like manner to foreigners to whom this Order applies, and all such foreigners shall be justiciable by the courts constituted by the said Order for the protectorate under the same conditions as British subjects, and to the extent of the jurisdiction vested by law in those courts; and Part XII² and so much of the rest of the Order as requires the consent of any foreigner as a condition of the exercise of jurisdiction shall be of no force or effect in the protectorate, so far as respects foreigners to whom this Order applies.'

The Order defined the expression 'foreigners to whom this Order applies' as meaning subjects of any of the Signatory Powers, except Her Majesty, or of any other Power which had consented that its subjects should be justiciable under the Africa Order of 1889 and the Order of 1892.

It will be seen that the jurisdiction exercisable under the Orders of 1889 and 1892, though very extensive in its scope, was still personal in its character.

These Orders were framed by the Foreign Office. But in the meantime the Colonial Office had been framing Orders which proceeded on different and bolder lines, and which appear to give jurisdiction in general terms, without distinction between British subjects and foreigners, and without reference to any acquiescence or consent, express or implied. The

¹ Part XIV provides for the registration of British subjects.

² As to civil jurisdiction over foreigners with the consent of themselves or their Governments.

was united with the East India Company, and the different stocks of the Company were united into a new joint stock. No copy of this charter is known to exist. Perhaps it was considered impolitic after the Restoration to preserve any evidence of favours obtained from the Protector.

The Com-
pany after
the Re-
storation.

During the period after the Restoration the fortunes of the Company are centred in the remarkable personality of Sir Josiah Child, and are depicted in the vivid pages of Macaulay. He has described how Child converted the Company from a Whig to a Tory Association, how he induced James II to become a subscriber to its capital, how his policy was temporarily baffled by the Revolution, how vigorously he fought and how lavishly he bribed to counteract the growing influence of the rival English Company.

Marks of royal favour are conspicuous in the charters of the Restoration period.

Charles
II's
charter of
1661.

The charter granted by Charles II on April 3, 1661, conferred new and important privileges on the Company. Their constitution remained practically unaltered, except that the joint-stock principle was recognized by giving each member one vote for every £500 subscribed by him to the Company's stock. But their powers were materially increased.

They were given 'power and command' over their fortresses, and were authorized to appoint governors and other officers for their government. The governor and council of each factory were empowered 'to judge all persons belonging to the said Governor and Company or that shall be under them, in all causes, whether civil or criminal, according to the laws of this kingdom, and to execute judgement accordingly.' And the chief factor and council of any place for which there was no governor were empowered to send offenders for punishment, either to a place where there was a governor and council, or to England.

The Company were also empowered to send ships of war, men, or ammunition for the security and defence of their factories and places of trade, and 'to choose commanders

Order made for the Bechuanaland Protectorate on May 9, 1891¹, after reciting that the territories of South Africa situate within the limits of the Order as described were under the protection of Her Majesty the Queen, and that by treaty, grant, usage, sufferance, and other lawful means Her Majesty had power and jurisdiction in those territories, enacted as follows :—

‘II. The high commissioner may, on Her Majesty’s behalf, exercise all powers and jurisdiction which Her Majesty, at any time before or after the date of this Order, had or may have within the limits of this Order, and to that end may take or cause to be taken all such measures, and may do or cause to be done all such matters and things within the limits of this Order as are lawful, and as in the interest of Her Majesty’s service he may think expedient, subject to such instructions as he may from time to time receive from Her Majesty or through a secretary of state.

‘III. The high commissioner may appoint so many fit persons as in the interest of Her Majesty’s service he may think necessary to be deputy commissioners, or resident commissioners, or assistant commissioners, or judges, magistrates, or other officers, and may define from time to time the districts within which such officers shall respectively discharge their functions.

‘Every such officer may exercise such powers and authorities as the high commissioner may assign to him, subject nevertheless to such directions and instructions as the high commissioner may from time to time think fit to give him.

‘The appointment of such officers shall not abridge, alter, or affect the right of the high commissioner to execute and discharge all the powers and authorities hereby conferred upon him.

‘The high commissioner may remove any officer so appointed.

‘IV. In the exercise of the powers and authorities hereby conferred upon him, the high commissioner may, amongst other things, from time to time, by proclamation provide for the administration of justice, the raising of revenue, and generally for the peace, order, and good government of all persons within the limits of this Order, including the prohibition and punishment of acts tending to disturb the public peace.

‘The high commissioner in issuing such proclamations shall respect any native laws or customs by which the civil relations of any native chiefs, tribes, or populations under Her Majesty’s protection are now regulated, except so far as the same may be incompatible with the due exercise of Her Majesty’s power and jurisdiction.

‘VII. The courts of British Bechuanaland shall have in respect of matters occurring within the limits of this Order the same jurisdiction,

¹ *Stat. R. and O. Rev.*, vol. v. p. 109.

civil and criminal, original and appellate, as they respectively possess from time to time in respect of matters occurring within British Bechuanaland, and the judgements, decrees, orders, and sentences of any such court made or given in the exercise of the jurisdiction hereby conferred may be enforced and executed, and appeals therefrom may be had and prosecuted, in the same way as if the judgement, decree, order, or sentence had been made or given under the ordinary jurisdiction of the court.

‘ But the jurisdiction hereby conferred shall only be exercised by such courts, and in such manner and to such extent, as the Governor of British Bechuanaland shall by proclamation from time to time direct.’

The Matabeleland Order in Council, 1894, now superseded by the Southern Rhodesia Order in Council, 1898, was framed on similar principles, and the same principles have been followed in the Orders which have since been made for different parts of South, East, and West Africa. They set up high courts and make administrative and legislative arrangements hardly distinguishable in their character from those adopted for regions which have been formally incorporated in the King’s dominions¹.

Conclusions as to jurisdiction under Foreign Jurisdiction Acts.

The general conclusions as to the classes of persons and cases with respect to which jurisdiction may be exercised by courts established by Orders in Council in accordance with the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts appear to be—

1. The principles on which the jurisdiction rests do not exclude its exercise with respect to any classes of persons being the subjects, or under the authority, of the State which establishes the court, or of the State in whose territory the court is established, or any classes of cases, whether civil or criminal.

2. But in practice the jurisdiction, being required mainly for the protection of foreigners, is not usually exercised in

¹ See the Africa Order printed in *Stat. R. and O. Rev.*, vol. v. The Orders in Council made for the ‘hinterland’ protectorates adjoining British colonies on the West Coast of Africa have, instead of defining the jurisdiction exercisable in protectorates, transferred the powers of legislating for them to the legislature of the adjacent British colony. The legislation under these powers is either specific or simply applies the colonial law. In some cases jurisdiction appears to be exercisable over all persons. In other cases it is left with the chiefs, subject to the direction and control of the British authorities.

disputes between natives of the country or in criminal proceedings which do not affect foreigners.

3. As respects persons who are not subjects either of the State which establishes the court, or of the State in whose territory the court is established, the exercise of the jurisdiction, according to the view adopted in framing most of the Orders in Council, requires consent, express or implied, on the part of those persons or of the States to whom they belong, but a general consent to the exercise of jurisdiction over all or any of the subjects of any State may be implied by acquiescence, or by such acts as the recognition of a protectorate.

4. In the case of certain protectorates in Africa the jurisdiction has been given in more general and indefinite terms, and apparently is capable of being exercised over any persons and in any cases over and in which territorial jurisdiction is exercisable ¹.

5. The Order in Council can limit and define in any manner which may be considered expedient the classes of persons and cases with respect to which jurisdiction is to be exercised.

In considering the application of the foregoing principles to India, the chief differences to be borne in mind are—

Applica-
tion of
principles
to India.

- (1) The limitations on the powers of the Indian Legislature, by which is meant the authority described in Acts of Parliament as 'the Governor-General in Council at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations' ;
- (2) The special relation in which the Government of India, as representative of the paramount Power, stands to the Native States.

¹ The references to native law and custom in some of these Orders clearly show that jurisdiction was intended to be exercised under them in cases between natives of the country. For a very curious illustration of the mode in which this kind of jurisdiction has been exercised on the West Coast of Africa, see *Fanti Customary Laws*, by J. M. Sarbah (London, 1897).

Powers of
Indian
Legisla-
ture.

The Indian Legislature is the creation of statute. Its powers are derived wholly from Acts of Parliament, and are limited with reference to persons, places, and subject-matter by the Acts of Parliament by which they are conferred.

Section 43 of the Government of India Act, 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85), empowered the Governor-General in Council to make, subject to certain restrictions, ' laws and regulations for repealing, amending, or altering any laws or regulations whatever then in force, or thereafter to be in force, in the said territories (i. e. the territories under the government of the East India Company), or any part thereof, and to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all courts of justice, whether established by His Majesty's charters or otherwise, and the jurisdictions thereof, and for all places and things whatsoever within and throughout the whole and every part of the said territories, and for all servants of the said Company within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with the said Company ' (i. e. the East India Company) ¹.

¹ As to the powers exercisable under this section the following opinion was given to the East India Company in 1839 :—

' We think the Legislative Council has power to make laws to provide for the punishment of offences in cases here contemplated. The Legislative Council has power to pass laws enacting and declaring that crimes and offences committed in the territories of princes or States in India adjacent to the British territories by persons, the native subjects of and owing obedience to the laws of such British territories, shall be liable to be tried and punished as if committed within the local limits of the British territories. Crimes and offences against the State, and the crimes of forgery, coining, &c., might frequently be committed without the limits of the Company's territories. Indeed, by the existing laws, British subjects are liable to be tried in the supreme courts for offences committed anywhere within the Company's limits. We do not consider the affirmative clause in 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 43, giving the power to the Legislative Council to make laws " for all servants of the said Company within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with the said Company," as restraining the Legislative Council from making laws for the purposes in question, but as either perhaps unnecessary or as meant to remove all doubt as to the power to bind servants of the Company in the particular case specified, who might not be (as occasionally happens) either natives or subjects of the British territories or British subjects of Her Majesty.

' We think that the Legislative Council has power in the same manner

This section has been superseded by the Indian Councils Act, 1861, and has been repealed, but is still of importance as the enactment under which the Penal Code of 1860 was made.

The enactments on which the powers of the Indian Legislature now depend are the Indian Councils Act, 1861, as supplemented by an Act of 1865 and an Act of 1869, and explained by an Act of 1892.

Section 22 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), empowered the Indian Legislature, subject to the provisions of the Act, to make laws and regulations for repealing, amending, or altering any laws or regulations whatever 'now in force or hereafter to be in force in the Indian territories now under the dominion of Her Majesty, and to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all courts of justice whatever, and for all places and things whatever, within the said territories, and for all servants of the Government of India within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty.'

Section 1 of the Government of India Act, 1865 (28 & 29 Vict. c. 15), after reciting that the Governor-General in Council had power to make laws and regulations for all persons, British or native, within the Indian dominions, and

to provide for the trial and punishment of crimes and offences committed upon the high seas, enacting and declaring them to be offences of the same quality and triable and punishable as if they had been committed on land, as has been done as to offences committed at sea by British statutes. It would, of course, be proper to limit the application of such a law to persons, natives and subjects, owing obedience to the laws of the British territories. For piracy, &c., provision has been made by existing laws.

(Signed)

J. CAMPBELL.

R. M. ROLFE.

R. SPANKIE,

JAMES WIGRAM.

'Temple, January 30, 1839.'

But it is difficult to reconcile this opinion with the opinion subsequently given as to the inability of the Indian Legislature to pass laws binding on natives of British India outside the territories of British India (see Forsyth, *Cases and Opinions on Constitutional Law*, pp. 17, 32).

that it was 'expedient to enlarge the powers of the Governor-General in Council by authorizing him to make laws and regulations for all British subjects within the dominions of' native princes, empowered the Indian Legislature to make laws and regulations for all British subjects of Her Majesty within the dominions of princes and States in India in alliance with Her Majesty, whether in the service of the Government of India or otherwise.

Section 1 of the Indian Councils Act, 1869 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 98), empowered the Indian Legislature to make laws and regulations for all persons, being native Indian subjects of Her Majesty, without and beyond as well as within the Indian territories under the dominion of Her Majesty.

Section 2 of the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14), explains that the expression 'now under the dominion of Her Majesty,' in the Act of 1861, is to be read as if the words 'or hereafter' were inserted after 'now.'

It will be observed that the expression used in the Act of 1861 is, 'within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty,' an expression substituted for and apparently framed on the words in the Act of 1833, 'princes and States in alliance with the said Company.' The expression in the Act of 1865 is, 'princes and States in India in alliance with Her Majesty.' The language used in the Act of 1861, if construed literally, would seem wide enough to include the territories of any friendly State, whether in Europe or elsewhere. But some limitation must be placed upon it, and it may perhaps be construed as including States having treaty relations with the Crown through the Government of India, whether subject to the suzerainty of Her Majesty or not¹. However this may be, the power of the Indian Legislature to make laws binding on persons, other than natives of British India, outside British India and the Native

¹ This seems to be the construction adopted by the late Mr. Justice Stephen, who says: 'The Government of India has power to legislate for public servants both in Native States included in British India, and in Native States adjacent to British India.' *History of Criminal Law*, ii. 12.

States of India, seems, under existing circumstances, to be open to question.

Doubts have also been raised as to the class of persons for whom, under the denomination of 'British subjects,' legislative powers may be exercised under the Act of 1865. The preamble of that Act speaks of 'all persons, *British or natives*, within the Indian dominions,' and the Act then gives power to legislate for *all British subjects* in Native States. It was accordingly argued that 'British subjects' did not include natives of British India¹. The difficulty arising from this particular doubt was removed by the wider language of the Act of 1869, but it is still not perfectly clear whether the power of the Indian Legislature under the Acts of 1865 and 1869 to make laws operating on British subjects outside British India extends to persons who are neither British subjects of European descent nor natives of British India. The earlier enactments relating to India were passed at a time when it was doubtful whether, or how far, British sovereignty extended beyond the presidency towns, and when full powers of sovereignty were not exercised over natives of the country even within those towns. Notwithstanding the declaration in the preamble to the Charter Act of 1813 that the possession of the territorial acquisitions of the Company in India was to be 'without prejudice to the undoubted sovereignty of the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in and over the same,' there was still room for doubt whether the native inhabitants of those possessions were British subjects within the meaning usually attached to that term by Acts of Parliament, and whether their status did not more nearly resemble that of natives of the territories in Africa which are under British protection, but have not been formally incorporated in the British dominions. Consequently the term 'British subject' has to be construed in a restricted sense in the earlier of these enactments, and it is possible that the restricted meaning

¹ See Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, Nos. 36 and 73.

which had been attached to it by usage still continued to attach to it when used in some of the enactments dating subsequently to the time when British India had passed under the direct and immediate sovereignty of the Crown. The term as used in Acts of Parliament was never precisely defined, and perhaps was treated as including generally white-skinned residents or sojourners in the country by way of contradistinction to the native population¹.

After the status of 'Roman citizenship' had been extended to all the inhabitants of British India, the Indian Legislature found it expedient to devise a term which should indicate the class formerly known as British subjects in the narrower sense, and for that purpose they invented the definition of European British subject, which is now to be found in s. 4 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898. That section declares that 'European British subject' means

'(1) Any subject of Her Majesty born, naturalized, or domiciled in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or in any of

¹ The doubts which were at one time entertained as to the meaning to be attached to the term 'British subject,' in its application to persons born or living in India, are well illustrated by a note which is quoted at p. 80 of Morley's *Digest* from an edition by Mr. L. Clarke of the statute 1 Geo. IV, c. 33. This note says: 'According to one opinion, all persons born within the Company's territories are British subjects. This opinion is founded on the supposition that these territories are British colonies, and stand in the same situation as the island of Bombay, the Canadas, the Cape of Good Hope, or any other colony which has been acquired by conquest or ceded by treaty. According to another opinion, those persons only are British who are natives, or the legitimate descendants of natives, of the United Kingdom or the colonies which are admitted to be annexed to the Crown. A third opinion considers Christianity to be a test of an individual being a British subject, provided that the person was born in the Company's territories; and according to this an Armenian, or the legitimate offspring (being a Christian) of English and native parents, would be a British subject. Nothing positive can be gathered from any of the Acts of Parliament, excepting that 1 Geo. IV, c. 33, appears to negative the position that Muhammadans and Hindus are British subjects; and the Jury Act, 7 Geo. IV, c. 37, seems to be equally opposed to any persons being British subjects but natives, or the legitimate descendants of natives, of the United Kingdom or its acknowledged colonies.'

See also the fifth Appendix to the Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1831, pp. 1114, 1112, 1116 et seq., 1118, 1120, 1220, 4th edition.

the European, American, or Australian colonies or possessions of Her Majesty, or in the colony of New Zealand, or in the colony of Cape of Good Hope or Natal;

(2) Any child or grandchild of any such person by legitimate descent.'

This definition is open to much criticism, and obviously errs both by way of redundancy and by way of deficiency. It can hardly be treated as a precise equivalent of the term 'British subject' in its older sense, although it is intended to have approximately the same meaning. If the term 'British subject' in the Act of 1865 were to be construed as equivalent to 'European British subject' in the Indian Code of Criminal Procedure, there would appear to be no power under the existing statutory enactments for the Indian Legislature to make laws, say, for a native of Ceylon in the territories of the Nizam. But the language of the Act of 1865 can hardly be construed by the light of an artificial definition which was invented at a subsequent date. And even if the expression is used in a restricted sense, probably the most reasonable construction to put on it is that it includes all British subjects except natives of India.

The Indian Legislature has also power under special enactments to make laws with extra-territorial operation on particular subjects. For instance, under the Indian Marine Service Act, 1884 (47 & 48 Vict. c. 38), the Indian Legislature may make laws for the Indian Marine Service with operation throughout Indian waters, which are defined as the high seas between the Cape of Good Hope on the west and the Straits of Magellan on the east, and any territorial waters between those limits.

So also s. 264 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict. c. 60), enacts that if the legislature of a British possession—an expression including India—by any law apply or adapt to any British ships registered at, trading with, or being at any port in that possession, and to the owners and masters and crews of those ships, any provisions in Part II of that Act which do not otherwise so apply, the

law is to have effect throughout His Majesty's dominions and in all places where His Majesty has jurisdiction in the same manner as if it were enacted in the Merchant Shipping Act itself.

In like manner s. 368 of the Merchant Shipping Act enacts that the Governor-General of India in Council may, by any Act passed for the purpose, declare that all or any of the provisions of Part III of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, shall apply to the carriage of steerage passengers upon any voyage from any specified port in British India to any other specified port whatsoever, and may for the purposes of Part III of the Act fix dietary scales, declare the space for steerage passengers, and do other things; and the provisions of any such Act while in force are to have effect without as well as within British India as if enacted by the Merchant Shipping Act itself.

Acts of the Imperial Parliament and charters made under or confirmed by such Acts have also given courts in British India extra-territorial jurisdiction which could not have been conferred on them by Acts of the Indian Legislature. See c. g. 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 156; 9 Geo. IV, c. 74, s. 1; 12 & 13 Vict. c. 96; 23 & 24 Vict. c. 88; 53 & 54 Vict. c. 27.

On the same principle the Slave Trade Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 46), enacted that if any person, being a subject of Her Majesty, or of any prince or State in India in alliance with Her Majesty, should on the high seas or in any part of Asia or Africa specified by Order in Council in that behalf commit any of certain offences relating to slave trade under the Penal Code, or abet the commission of any such offence, he will be dealt with as if the offence or abetment had been committed in any place within British India in which he may be or may be found; and, under s. 2, if the Governor-General in Council amends any of those provisions or makes further provisions on the same subject, a copy of the amending Act may be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and then, unless an address is presented to the contrary, the King

service in India 'to the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces now under the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal,' a designation then appropriate, but since made inappropriate by the annexation of the Punjab. Power was also given to declare and limit the extent of the territories so placed under a lieutenant-governor, and of the authority to be exercised by him. The arrangements thus temporarily made by the Act of 1835 were continued by the Act of 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 15). A lieutenant-governor of the North-Western Provinces was first appointed by notification, dated February 29, 1836 (Calcutta Gazette for March 2, 1836, second supplement). This notification merely gave the lieutenant-governor the powers of the Governor of Agra, and those powers, as defined by 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, did not include any of the powers of the Governor-General in Council under the Bengal Regulations. The power given by the Act of 1835 to define the authority of the lieutenant-governor is probably superseded by the powers under 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 4.

The Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces used to be also Chief Commissioner of Oudh. In 1901, when the North-West Frontier Province was constituted, the old North-Western Provinces were united with Oudh under a lieutenant-governor, and the two provinces were designated the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. The union was confirmed by Act VII of 1902.

(c) Section 17 of the Act of 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95) enacts that:—
'It shall be lawful for the Court of Directors of the said Company, under such direction and control, if and when they think fit, to constitute one new presidency within the territories subject for the time being to the government of the said Company, and to declare and appoint what part of such territories shall be subject to the government of such new presidency; and unless and until such new presidency be constituted as aforesaid, it shall be lawful for the said Court of Directors, under such direction and control as aforesaid, if and when they think fit, to authorize (in addition to such appointments as are hereinbefore authorized to be continued and made for the territories now and heretofore under the said Presidency of Fort William) the appointment by the said Governor-General in Council of a lieutenant-governor for any part of the territories for the time being subject to the government of the said Company, and to declare for what part of the said territories such lieutenant-governor shall be appointed, and the extent of his authority, and from time to time to revoke or alter any such declaration.'

The power of constituting a new presidency was not exercised, but that of appointing a new lieutenant-governor was exercised in 1859 by the appointment of Sir John Lawrence as Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab. The rule of construction applied to recent Acts of Parliament by s. 32 of the Interpretation Act, 1889 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 63), does not apply to the Act of 1853, and, apart from this, the power of appointing fresh lieutenant-governors under the Act of 1853 was probably exhausted by the constitution of a lieutenant-governor.

may by Order in Council give the amending provisions the same extra-territorial operation as the provisions amended¹.

The Indian Legislature has exercised its power of legislating for offences committed outside British India by provisions which are to be found in the Penal Code of 1860 and in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

Under s. 3 of the Penal Code, any person liable by any law passed by the Governor-General of India in Council to be tried for an offence committed beyond the territories of British India, is to be dealt with according to the provisions of the Code, for any act committed beyond those territories, in the same manner as if the act had been committed within them.

Under s. 4 of the Penal Code, every servant of the King is subject to punishment under the Code for every act or omission contrary to its provisions, of which, whilst in such service, he is guilty within the dominions of any prince or State in alliance with the King by virtue of any treaty or engagement theretofore entered into by the East India Company or made in the name of the Crown by any Government of India.

Section 188 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, enacts that—

When a native Indian subject of Her Majesty commits an offence at any place without and beyond the limits of British India, or	Liability of British subjects for offences committed out of British India.
when any British subject commits an offence in the territories of any Native Prince or Chief in India, or	
when a servant of the Queen (whether a British subject or not) commits an offence in the territories of any Native Prince or Chief in India, he may be dealt with in respect of such offence as if it had been committed at any place within British India at which he may be found :	
Provided that no charge as to any such offence shall be inquired into in British India unless the Political Agent, if there is one, for the territory in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, certifies that, in his opinion, the charge ought to be inquired into in British India ; and, where there is no Political Agent, the sanction of the Local Government shall be required :	Political Agents to certify fitness of inquiry into charge.

¹ See remarks on this enactment in Westlake, *Chapters on Principles of International Law*, p. 222.

XXI of
1870.

Provided, also, that any proceedings taken against any person under this section which would be a bar to subsequent proceedings against such person for the same offence if such offence had been committed in British India shall be a bar to further proceedings against him under the Foreign Jurisdiction and Extradition Act, 1870, in respect of the same offence in any territory beyond the limits of British India.

The provisions of the existing Code of Criminal Procedure may be taken to represent the construction which the Indian Legislature has thought it safe and prudent to place on the enactments giving that legislature power to make laws with extra-territorial operation¹.

Conclu-
sions as to
general
powers
of Indian
Legisla-
ture.

The general conclusions appear to be

1. The Indian Legislature is not in any sense an agent or delegate of the Imperial Parliament², but its powers are limited by the terms of the Acts of Parliament by which those powers are conferred.

2. The Indian Legislature has power to make laws

(a) for native Indian subjects of His Majesty or native Indian soldiers in His Majesty's Indian forces in any part of the world; and

(b) for British subjects, in a narrow sense, and servants of the Government, in Native States.

3. Whether the Indian Legislature has power to make laws for British subjects, not being either European British subjects or natives of India, in Native States, or to make

¹ The construction of the provisions as to extra-territorial jurisdiction in earlier editions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and in the Indian Foreign Jurisdiction and Extradition Act, 1870, now superseded by an Order under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act of the British Parliament, gave rise, in the Indian courts, to difficult questions, which are illustrated by the following cases: *R. v. Pirtal*, (1873) 10 Bom. Rep. 350; *R. v. Lakhya Gorind*, (1875) I. L. R. 1 Bom. 50; *Empress v. Surmook Singh*, (1870) I. L. R. 2 All. 218; *Empress v. S. Moorga Chetty*, (1881) I. L. R. 3 Bom. 338; *Siddha v. Biligiri*, (1884) I. L. R. 7 Mad. 354; *Queen Empress v. Edwards*, (1884) I. L. R. 9 Bom. 333; *Queen v. Abdul Latib*, (1884) I. L. R. 10 Bom. 186; *Gregory v. Vudakasi Kanjani*, (1886) I. L. R. 10 Mad. 21; *Queen Empress v. Mangul Takehand*, (1886) I. L. R. 10 Bom. 274; *Queen Empress v. Kirpal Singh*, (1887) I. L. R. 9 All. 523; *Queen Empress v. Patra Bhima*, (1888) I. L. R. 13 Bom. 147; *Re Hayes*, (1889) I. L. R. 12 Mad. 69; *Queen Empress v. Natwarai*, (1891) I. L. R. 10 Bom. 178; *Queen Empress v. Ganpatras Ram Chandra*, (1893) I. L. R. 19 Bom. 105.

² *R. v. Burah*, I. L. R. 3 App. Cas. 880.

laws for British subjects not being natives of India, or for servants of the Government, as such, in States outside India as defined by the Interpretation Act and by the Indian General Clauses Act, that is to say, in places which are not either in British India or in the territory of a Native State, is open to question.

4. Except in these cases, and except in pursuance of special enactments, such as the Indian Marine Service Act, the operation of Acts of the Indian Legislature is strictly territorial, and extends only to persons and things within British India.

5. The Indian Legislature has gone further than Parliament in the exercise of the extra-territorial powers which it possesses.

But the Governor-General in Council has in his executive capacity extra-territorial powers far wider than those which may be exercised by the Indian Legislature. By successive charters and acts extensive powers of sovereignty have been delegated by the English Crown, first, to the East India Company, and afterwards to the Governor-General in Council as its successor. The Governor-General in Council is the representative in India of the British Crown, and as such can exercise under delegated authority the powers incidental to sovereignty with reference both to British India and to neighbouring territories, subject to the restrictions imposed by Parliamentary legislation and to the control exercised by the Crown through the Secretary of State for India. Thus he can make treaties and conventions with the rulers, not only of Native States within the boundaries of what is usually treated as India, but also of adjoining States which are commonly treated as extra-Indian, such as Afghanistan and Nepaul, and can acquire and exercise within the territories of such States powers of legislation and jurisdiction similar to those which are exercised by the Crown in foreign countries in accordance with the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts and the Orders in Council under them, and extending to persons who are not subjects of the King.

Extra-territorial powers of governor-general in executive capacity.

The existence of these powers was until recently declared, and their exercise was to some extent regulated, by the Foreign Jurisdiction and Extradition Act, 1879, of the Government of India, which contained recitals corresponding to those in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890, passed by the Parliament at Westminster. But a few years ago it was recognized that the extra-territorial powers exercisable by the Governor-General in Council, as representative of the British Crown, rested on the same principles, and might with advantage be based on the same statutory foundations, as the extra-territorial powers of the British Crown in other parts of the world. Accordingly, in 1902, an Order in Council under the Act of 1890 made provision for the exercise of foreign jurisdiction by the Governor-General of India in Council, and the Indian Act of 1879, having been superseded as to foreign jurisdiction by this Order, and as to other matters by later Indian legislation, was formally repealed by the Indian Act XV of 1903.

The Order of 1902 is of sufficient importance to justify its being set out in full. It runs as follows :

1. This Order may be cited as the Indian (Foreign Jurisdiction) Order in Council, 1902.

2. The limits of this Order are the territories of India outside British India, and any other territories which may be declared by His Majesty in Council to be territories in which jurisdiction is exercised by or on behalf of His Majesty through the Governor-General of India in Council, or some authority subordinate to him, including the territorial waters of any such territories.

3. The Governor-General of India in Council may, on His Majesty's behalf, exercise any power or jurisdiction which His Majesty or the Governor-General of India in Council for the time being has within the limits of this Order, and may delegate any such power or jurisdiction to any servant of the British Indian Government in such manner, and to such extent, as the Governor-General in Council from time to time thinks fit.

4. The Governor-General in Council may make such rules and orders as may seem expedient for carrying this Order into effect, and in particular—

(a) for determining the law and procedure to be observed, whether by applying with or without modifications all or any of the provisions of any enactment in force elsewhere, or otherwise ;

(b) for determining the persons who are to exercise jurisdiction, either generally or in particular classes of cases, and the powers to be exercised by them ;

(c) for determining the courts, authorities, judges, and magistrates, by whom, and for regulating the manner in which, any jurisdiction, auxiliary or incidental to or consequential on the jurisdiction exercised under this Order, is to be exercised in British India ;

(d) for regulating the amount, collection, and application of fees.

5. All appointments, delegations, certificates, requisitions, rules, notifications, processes, orders, and directions made or issued under or in pursuance of any enactment of the Indian Legislature regulating the exercise of foreign jurisdiction, are hereby confirmed, and shall have effect as if made or issued under this Order.

6. The Interpretation Act, 1889, shall apply to the construction of this Order.

The substitution of an Order in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890, for an Act of the Indian Legislature has placed the extra-territorial jurisdiction of the Governor-General in Council on a wider and firmer basis, and has removed many of the doubts and difficulties to which reference was made in the first edition of this book, and which arose from the limitations on the powers of the Indian Legislature, and from the language of the statutes by which those powers were conferred.

The language of the Order is wide enough to include every possible source of extra-territorial authority. The powers delegated are both executive and legislative, and are sufficiently extensive to cover all the extra-territorial powers previously exercised in accordance with Indian Acts. To guard against any breach of continuity, all appointments, rules, orders and other things made or done under any previous Indian Act regulating the exercise of foreign jurisdiction are expressly confirmed, and are to have effect as if made or done under the Order of 1902. The orders thus confirmed; and the orders issued under the new system, have usually taken the form of orders for different Native States, or for regions or districts or places within them, constituting civil and criminal courts of different grades, and declaring the law which they are to administer, that law consisting of

certain British Indian Acts with specified modifications. These orders are notified in the *Gazette* of India and are to be found in volumes issued by the Legislative Department of the Government of India. In editing these volumes the Legislative Department takes care to discriminate between enactments of the Indian Legislature which apply *proprio vigore* to certain classes of persons in Native States, and enactments which are, in the official language of India, 'applied' to certain portions of the territory of Native States, that is to say, become law by virtue of the Governor-General's order.

The local limits of the Order of 1902, that is to say, the areas within which, or with respect to which, jurisdiction and powers may be exercised under the Order, are, in the first place, the territories of India outside British India, in other words, the territories which are popularly known as the Native States of India, and which are described more technically in the Interpretation Act, 1889¹, as territories of any native prince or chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty exercised through the Governor-General of India, or through any governor or other officer subordinate to the Governor-General of India. The actual extent of 'India' at any given time must always be a political question. And there may often be territories on the external fringe of, or outside, 'India,' within which it may be doubtful whether the British Crown has power and jurisdiction, and whether and how far that power and jurisdiction is delegated to the Governor-General in Council. These are the territories described in the preamble to the Order of 1902 as 'territories adjacent to India,' and the limits of the Order are declared by s. 2 to be not only 'the territories of India outside British India, but any other territories which may be declared by His Majesty in Council to be territories in which jurisdiction is exercised by or on behalf of His Majesty through the Governor-General in Council or some authority subordinate to him.' No such declaration has yet been made.

¹ 52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 18 (5).

The territories within the limits of the Order are expressly declared to include the territorial waters of those territories. For instance, they include the territorial waters of Cutch.

The powers expressly conferred by the Act of 1890 of sending persons for trial to British territory (s. 6) and of assigning jurisdiction, original or appellate, to Courts in British territory (s. 9), may occasionally be found useful, but hardly go beyond the powers previously exercised in practice in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Acts.

The Act of 1890 does not contain any provision corresponding to s. 5 of the Indian Act of 1879, under which a notification in the *Gazette* of India was made conclusive proof of matters stated in relation to the exercise or delegation of jurisdiction. But, by s. 4 of the Act of 1890, a Secretary of State is empowered, on the request of a court of civil or criminal jurisdiction, to send an authoritative decision on any question which may arise as to the existence or extent of any jurisdiction of His Majesty in a foreign country.

The cases in which an authoritative decision of this kind, given under a full sense of political responsibility, is most likely to be found useful, are cases where jurisdiction, limited to special classes of persons or subjects, is exercised beyond the limits of India. With respect to the Native States of India one may anticipate that it will rarely, if ever, be needed. In these States there is no doubt that the British Crown has power and jurisdiction, and that this power and jurisdiction is delegated to the Governor-General in Council, and experience shows that the doubts which have from time to time been suggested as to the nature and extent of the powers so delegated rarely give rise to practical difficulties.

The Governor-General, as representative of the paramount power in India, has and exercises extensive sovereign powers over the Native States of India. Those Native States have often, and not improperly, been described as protectorates.

But they are protectorates in a very special sense. They differ materially from the European protectorates to which

reference is made in textbooks of European international law. They also differ from the protectorates established over uncivilized tribes and the territories occupied by them in Africa, because in all the Indian Native States, with the exception of some wild regions on the frontier, there is some kind of organized government to undertake the functions of internal administration. For the purposes of municipal law their territory is not British territory, and their subjects are not British subjects. But they have none of the attributes of external sovereignty, and for international purposes their territory is in the same position as British territory and their subjects are in the same position as British subjects. On the other hand, it may be doubted whether the subject of an Indian Native State would be an alien within the meaning of s. 7 of the Naturalization Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 14), so as to be capable of obtaining a certificate of naturalization under that section. Finally, the rulers of Indian Native States owe political allegiance to the King Emperor. These peculiarities have an important bearing on the jurisdiction exercisable over European foreigners within the territories of those States.

Classes of
persons to
which
jurisdic-
tion
extends.

In point of fact the jurisdiction of the Governor-General in Council within the territories of Native States is exercised —

- (a) over European British subjects in all cases ;
- (b) over native Indian subjects in certain cases ;
- (c) over all classes of persons, British or foreign, within certain areas.

It is the policy of the Government of India not to allow native courts to exercise jurisdiction in the case of European British subjects, but to require them either to be tried by the British courts established in the Native State, or to be sent for trial before a court in British India.

The Government of India does not claim similar exclusive jurisdiction over native Indian subjects of His Majesty when within Native States, but doubtless would assert jurisdiction over such persons in cases where it thought the assertion

necessary. Apparently it does not in ordinary cases treat as native Indian subjects of His Majesty persons who are natural-born subjects by statute, that is to say, by reason of being children or grandchildren of native Indian subjects. But perhaps the question how such persons ought to be treated does not arise in a practical form.

The Government of India does not, except within special areas, or under special circumstances, such as during the minority of a native prince, take over or interfere with the jurisdiction of the courts of a Native State in cases affecting only the subjects of that State, but leaves such cases to be dealt with by the native courts in accordance with native laws.

The question as to whether the jurisdiction is exercisable over European foreigners in the territory of a Native State, if it should arise, would doubtless be answered as in the case of African protectorates. Even if consent of the foreigner's Government were held to be a necessary element of the jurisdiction in such cases, the notorious fact that a Native State of India is not allowed to hold diplomatic or other official intercourse with any other Power, and the general recognition by European States of the relation in which every such Native State stands to the British Crown, would doubtless be construed as implying a consent on the part of the Government of any European or American State to the exercise by British courts of jurisdiction. Indeed, for international purposes, as has been said above, the territory of Native States is in the same position as the territory of British India.

There are certain areas within which full jurisdiction has been ceded to the Government of India, and within which jurisdiction is accordingly exercised by courts and officers of the Government of India over all classes of persons as if the territory were part of British India. The most conspicuous instance of this is the district known as the Berars, or as the Hyderabad Assigned Districts, which, although held under a perpetual lease, and administered as if it were part of the

Central Provinces, is not, technically, within British India ¹. The same appears to be the position of the residencies and other stations in the occupation of political officers ², and of cantonments in the occupation of British troops.

Under arrangements which have been made with the Governments of several Native States, 'full jurisdiction' has been ceded in railway lands within the territories of those States. The effect of one of these grants was considered in a case which came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1897 ³. In this case a magistrate at Simla issued a warrant for the arrest of a subject of the Nizam, in respect of an offence alleged to have been committed by him at Simla. The warrant was executed within the area of railway lands over which 'full jurisdiction' had been conceded by the Nizam, and the question was whether the execution of the warrant under these circumstances was legal. It was held that for the purpose of ascertaining the nature and extent of the 'full jurisdiction' conceded, reference must be made to the correspondence which had taken place between the Government of India and the Nizam, as showing the nature of the agreement between them, that on the true construction of this correspondence, the jurisdiction conceded must be limited to jurisdiction required for railway purposes, and that consequently the execution of the warrant was illegal.

The position of the residencies and cantonments in the territories of Native States has often been compared to the extra-territorial character recognized by European international law as belonging to diplomatic residencies and to cantonments in time of war. There is an analogy between the cases, but it is unnecessary to base the jurisdiction exercised in those places on that analogy. As has been seen above,

¹ See East India (Hyderabad) Agreement respecting the Hyderabad Assigned Districts, 1902; Cd. 1321.

² As to the civil and military station of Bangalore, see *Re Hayes*, (1888)—I. L. R. 12 Mad. 39.

³ *Muhammed Yusuf-Ud-Din v. The Queen Empress* (July 7, 1897).

ship of the Punjab. Further powers of constituting lieutenant-governorships are given by s. 46 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Viet. c. 67), but apparently are exercisable only when a new legislative council is established. See the note on s. 74 below. It was under these further powers that in 1807 Burma, and in 1905 Eastern Bengal and Assam, were constituted lieutenant-governorships.

(d) See 21 & 22 Viet. c. 106, s. 29.

(e) This provision applies in terms only to the lieutenant-governors of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces (now united with Oudh), but its operation has been perhaps extended by the final words of 21 & 22 Viet. c. 106, s. 29.

(f) This sub-section reproduces s. 4 of the Act of 1854 (17 & 18 Viet. c. 77), which, however, applies in terms only to the two older lieutenant-governorships, the language being: 'It shall be lawful for the said Governor-General of India in Council, with the like sanction and approbation [i. e. of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control], from time to time to declare and limit the extent of the authority of the Governor in Council, Governor, or Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, or of Agra, or the North-Western Provinces, who is now, or may be hereafter, appointed.' But a power to alter the limits of provinces is given by other enactments. See s. 57 below.

56. The Governor-General in Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, and by notification in the Gazette of India, take any part of British India under the immediate authority and management of the Governor-General in Council, and thereupon give all necessary orders and directions respecting the administration of that part, or otherwise provide for the administration thereof.

Power to place territory under authority of Governor-General in Council. [17 & 18 Viet. c. 77, s. 3.]

There is reason to believe that the enactment reproduced by this section was passed in consequence of a minute of Sir Barnes Peacock, forming an enclosure to a dispatch from the Government of India, dated July 16, 1852, and that it was mainly designed to give the Governor-General in Council the power which, according to Sir Barnes Peacock, he had not, of taking under his immediate executive control territory which formed part of some one of the presidencies. The section has been thus applied in various cases. Thus Arakan, which was originally annexed to Lower Bengal, was under this section taken into the hands of the Governor-General in Council and annexed to British Burma (Foreign Department Notification, No. 30 (Political), dated January 16, 1862). The province of Assam (now united with Eastern Bengal) was constituted by removing it under this section from the lieutenant-governorship of Bengal, taking it under the Governor-General in Council, and constituting it a chief commissioner-ship, the regulation district of Sylhet being subsequently added to it in the same manner (Home Department Proclamation, No. 379,

the jurisdiction exercisable by the courts of a protecting State within the territories of a protected State may extend to all or any of the subjects, either of the protecting State or of the protected State, and, subject to certain limitations, to persons not belonging to either of these categories. The extent to which, and the cases in which, the jurisdiction is exercised over particular classes of persons are to be determined by agreement between the State which exercises the jurisdiction and the State within whose territories the jurisdiction is exercised, and, in the absence of express agreement, are to be inferred from usage and from the circumstances of the case.

In connexion with this subject, it may be useful to quote Sir Henry Maine's remarks in his minute on Kathiawar¹ :—

'It may perhaps be worth observing that, according to the more precise language of modern publicists, "sovereignty" is divisible, but "independence" is not. Although the expression "partial independence" may be popularly used, it is technically incorrect. Accordingly, there may be found in India every shade and variety of sovereignty, but there is only one independent sovereign, the British Government. My reason for offering a remark which may perhaps appear pedantic is that the Indian Government seems to me to have occasionally exposed itself to misconstruction by admitting or denying the independence of particular States, when, in fact, it meant to speak of their sovereignty.

'The mode or degree in which sovereignty is distributed between the British Government and any given Native State is always a question of fact, which has to be separately decided in each case, and to which no general rules apply. In the more considerable instances, there is always some treaty, engagement, or sunnud to guide us to a conclusion, and then the only question which remains is, what has become of the sovereign rights which are *not* mentioned in the Convention? Did the British Government reserve them to itself, or did it intend to leave the Native Power in the enjoyment of them? In the case of Kattywar the few ambiguous documents which bear on the matter seem to me to point to no certain result, and I consider that the distribution of the sovereignty can only be collected from the *de facto* relations of these States with the British Government, from the course of action which has been followed by this Government towards them. Though we have to interpret this evidence ourselves, it is in itself perfectly legitimate.

'It appears to me, therefore, that the Kattywar States have been permitted to enjoy several sovereign rights, of which the principal—

and it is a well-known right of sovereignty—is immunity from foreign laws. Their chiefs have also been allowed to exercise (within limits) civil and criminal jurisdiction, and several of them have been in the exercise of a very marked (though minor) sovereign right—the right to coin money. But far the largest part of the sovereignty has obviously resided in practice with the British Government, and among the rights which it has exercised appears to me to be an almost unlimited right of interference for the better order of the States. I mean that, if the interferences which have already taken place be referred to principles, those principles would justify any amount of interposition, so long as we interpose in good faith for the advantage of the chiefs and people of Kattywar, and so long as we do not disturb the only unqualified sovereign right which these States appear to possess—the right to immunity from foreign laws¹.

From what has been said above it will be seen that the powers exercised by the British Government, or by the Government of India as its representative, in territories where lower types of government or civilization prevail, may vary both in nature and in extent between very wide limits. In some places there is merely the exercise of a personal jurisdiction over British subjects, or certain other limited classes of persons. In others the functions of external sovereignty are exercised or controlled. In others, again, a much larger share of the functions of sovereignty, both external and internal, has been taken over, and this share may be so large as to leave to the previous ruler of the territory, if such there be, nothing more than a bare, nominal, or dormant sovereignty².

In dealing with the various positions thus arising, it is important to remember that different considerations will apply according as the position is approached from the point of view of international law, or from the point of view of municipal law.

¹ As to Kathiawar see the two cases decided in 1905 by the Judicial Committee, *Hemchand Devehand v. Azam Sakarlal Chhotamlal*, and *The Taluka of Kotda Sangani v. The State of Gondal*, A.C. [1906], p. 212; referred to above, p. 265.

² A curious illustration of the extent to which the exercise of sovereign rights can be claimed without the claim of territorial sovereignty is supplied by the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama with respect to the territory within the 'Canal Zone.'

Where the external sovereignty of any State is exercised or controlled by the British Government, a third State will almost certainly claim to regard, and will, from an international point of view, be entitled to regard, the territory of the first State as being for many purposes practically British. Thus if persons in that territory made it a basis for raids on the territory of an adjoining foreign State, that State would hold the British Government accountable. And it would be no answer to say that the arrangements entered into by the British Government with the ruler of that territory preclude British interference in such cases. The reply would be, 'We know nothing of these arrangements, except that they debar us from obtaining protection or redress, except through you, and consequently we must treat the territory as practically British.' A similar position would arise if a subject of that foreign State were grossly ill-used within the territory, and were denied justice by the persons exercising authority there.

The view taken by municipal law is widely different. For the purposes of that law a territory must be either British or foreign, that is to say, not British, and a sharp line must be drawn between the two. In some cases it may be a difficult operation to draw this line, but it must be drawn by the courts and by the executive authorities as best they can. To allow the existence of a penumbra between British and non-British territory would cause endless confusion. The judicial and executive authorities must be in a position to say whether, for purposes of municipal law, a particular territory is within or without 'His Majesty's dominions' or 'British India.' And the legislative authorities must be in a position to determine whether the legislation for such a territory is to be carried out through the ordinary legislative organs, or through the machinery recognized and supported by the Foreign Jurisdiction Acts. Again, important questions of status may turn on the question whether the territory in which a man is born is British territory or not. To deter-

and it is a well-known right of sovereignty—is immunity from foreign laws. Their chiefs have also been allowed to exercise (within limits) civil and criminal jurisdiction, and several of them have been in the exercise of a very marked (though minor) sovereign right—the right to coin money. But far the largest part of the sovereignty has obviously resided in practice with the British Government, and among the rights which it has exercised appears to me to be an almost unlimited right of interference for the better order of the States. I mean that, if the interferences which have already taken place be referred to principles, those principles would justify any amount of interposition, so long as we interpose in good faith for the advantage of the chiefs and people of Kattywar, and so long as we do not disturb the only unqualified sovereign right which these States appear to possess—the right to immunity from foreign laws¹.

From what has been said above it will be seen that the powers exercised by the British Government, or by the Government of India as its representative, in territories where lower types of government or civilization prevail, may vary both in nature and in extent between very wide limits. In some places there is merely the exercise of a personal jurisdiction over British subjects, or certain other limited classes of persons. In others the functions of external sovereignty are exercised or controlled. In others, again, a much larger share of the functions of sovereignty, both external and internal, has been taken over, and this share may be so large as to leave to the previous ruler of the territory, if such there be, nothing more than a bare, nominal, or dormant sovereignty².

In dealing with the various positions thus arising, it is important to remember that different considerations will apply according as the position is approached from the point of view of international law, or from the point of view of municipal law.

¹ As to Kathiawar see the two cases decided in 1905 by the Judicial Committee, *Hemchand Devchand v. Azam Sakarlal Chhotamlal*, and *The Taluka of Kotda Sangani v. The State of Gondal*, A.C. [1906], p. 212; referred to above, p. 265.

² A curious illustration of the extent to which the exercise of sovereign rights can be claimed without the claim of territorial sovereignty is supplied by the treaty between the United States and the Republic of Panama with respect to the territory within the 'Canal Zone.'

'Or any provisions of any Act passed in this present session of Parliament, or hereafter to be passed, or anywise affecting Her Majesty's Indian territories, or the inhabitants thereof:

'Or which may affect the authority of Parliament, or the constitution and rights of the East India Company, or any part of the unwritten laws or constitution of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, whereon may depend in any degree the allegiance of any person to the Crown of the United Kingdom, or the sovereignty or dominion of the Crown over any part of the said territories.'

By s. 1 of the Government of India Act, 1865 (28 & 29 Vict. c. 15), the Governor-General of India was empowered, at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations, to make laws and regulations for all British subjects of Her Majesty within the dominions of princes and States in India in alliance with Her Majesty, whether in the service of the Government of India or otherwise.

By s. 1 of the Indian Councils Act, 1869 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 98), the Governor-General of India in Council was empowered, at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations, to make laws and regulations for all persons being native Indian subjects of Her Majesty within and beyond as well as within the Indian territories under the dominions of Her Majesty. And under s. 3 of the same Act a law or regulation so made is not to be invalid by reason only of its repealing or affecting ss. 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, or 86 of the Government of India Act, 1833.

The Indian Marine Service Act, 1881 (44 & 48 Vict. c. 38), gives power to make laws for the Indian Marine Service.

Section 45 of the Government of India Act, 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85), enacts that all laws and regulations made under that Act, so long as they remain unrepealed, shall be of the same force and effect within and throughout the Indian territories as any Act of Parliament would or ought to be within the same territories, and shall be taken notice of by all courts of justice whatsoever within the same territories in the same manner as any public Act of Parliament would or ought to be taken notice of, and it shall not be necessary to register or publish in any court of justice any laws or regulations made by the said Governor-General in Council. This enactment has not been repealed, but the first part of it applies in terms only to laws made under the powers given by the Act of 1833, and is not reproduced in the Act of 1861, or expressly made applicable to laws made under the powers given by that Act. Its repetition or application was probably considered unnecessary in 1861. The exemption from the obligation to register, which is in general terms, was enacted with reference to the questions which had arisen as to the necessity for registering enactments made under various statutory powers conferred before 1833. (See above, p. 59.)

The powers of legislation reproduced in this Digest are not exhaustive. Under various Acts of Parliament the Indian Legislature, like other

as to be almost nugatory, and professed his willingness to receive any suggestions made for checking an abuse of the powers proposed to be conferred by the Bill.

The questions were eventually settled by a compromise. The Board of Control obtained the powers for which they asked, but a limit was imposed on the number of troops which might be charged to Indian revenues. At the same time the Board of Control were prevented from increasing any salary or awarding any gratuity without the concurrence of the directors and of Parliament, and the directors were required to lay annually before Parliament an account of the Company's receipts and disbursements¹.

In 1793, towards the close of Lord Cornwallis' governor-generalship, it became necessary to take steps for renewal of the Company's charter. Pitt was then at the height of his power; his most trusted friend, Dundas², was President of the Board of Control; the war with France, which had just been declared, monopolized English attention; and Indian finances were, or might plausibly be represented as being, in a tolerably satisfactory condition. Accordingly the Act of 1793³, which was introduced by Dundas, passed without serious opposition, and introduced no important alterations. It was a measure of consolidation, repealing several previous enactments, and runs to an enormous length, but the amendments made by it relate to matters of minor importance.

The two junior members of the Board of Control were no longer required to be Privy Councillors. Provision was made for payment of the members and staff of the Board out of Indian revenues.

The commander-in-chief was not to be a member of the council at Fort William unless specially appointed by the

¹ 28 Geo. III, c. 8; Clode, *Military Forces of the Crown*, i. 270.

² Henry Dundas, who afterwards became the first Viscount Melville. He did not become president till June 22, 1793, but had long been the most powerful member of the Board.

³ 33 Geo. III, c. 52.

or in the Northern Circars, or within the territories of the Soubah of the Deccan, the Nabob of Arcot, or the Rajah of Tanjore.

Legisla-
tion of
1788.

In 1788 a serious difference arose between the Board of Control and the Board of Directors as to the limits of their respective powers. The Board of Control, notwithstanding the objections of the directors, ordered out four royal regiments to India, and charged their expenses to Indian revenues. They maintained that they had this power under the Act of 1784. The directors on the other hand argued that under provisions of the Act of 1781, which were still unrepealed, the Company could not be compelled to bear the expenses of any troops except those sent out on their own requisition. Pitt proposed to settle the difference in favour of the Board of Control by means of an explanatory or declaratory Act. The discussions which took place on this measure raised constitutional questions which have been revived in later times ¹.

It was objected that troops raised by the Company in India would suffice and could be much more cheaply maintained. It was also argued on constitutional grounds that no troops ought to belong to the king for which Parliament did not annually vote the money.

In answer to the first objection Pitt confessed that, in his opinion, the army in India ought to be all on one establishment, and should all belong to the king, and declared that it was mainly in preparation for this reform that the troops were to be conveyed ².

With respect to the second objection he argued that the Bill of Rights and the Mutiny Act, which were the only positive enactments on the subject, were so vague and indefinite

¹ See the discussion in 1878 as to the employment of Indian troops in Malta, Hansard, cexl. 14, and Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, pt. ii. p. 361 (2nd ed.).

² Lord Cornwallis was at this time considering a scheme for the combination of the king's and Company's forces. See *Cornwallis Correspondence*, i. 251, 341; ii. 316, 572.

RECEIVED-19
FILE

1900
H36

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BEING A DIGEST OF THE STATUTE LAW
RELATING THERETO

LIBRARY
STATE

WITH HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

AND

EXPLANATORY MATTER

22 DEC 1903

BY

SIR COURTENAY ILBERT, K.C.S.I.

CHIEF OF THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION
SOMETIME LAW MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA

Checked
1925

SECOND EDITION

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON AND NEW YORK: HENRY FROWDE

PRINTED BY

STEVENS & SONS, LIMITED, 100, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON

1907

governor-general might invest himself with all the powers exercisable by the Governor-General in Council, except the powers with respect to legislation ¹.

For purposes of legislation the governor-general's council was reinforced by additional members, not less than six nor more than twelve in number, nominated by the governor-general and holding office for two years. Of these additional members, not less than one-half were to be non-official, that is to say, persons not in the civil or military service of the Crown ². The lieutenant-governor of a province was also to be an additional member whenever the council held a legislative sitting within his province.

The Legislative Council established under the Act of 1853 had modelled its procedure on that of Parliament, and had shown what was considered an inconvenient degree of independence by asking questions as to, and discussing the propriety of, measures of the Executive Government ³. The functions of the new Legislative Council were limited strictly to legislation, and it was expressly forbidden to transact any business except the consideration and enactment of legislative measures, or to entertain any motion except a motion for leave to introduce a Bill, or having reference to a Bill actually introduced ⁴.

Measures relating to the public revenue or debt, religion, military or naval matters, or foreign relations, were not to be introduced without the governor-general's sanction. The assent of the governor-general was required to every Act passed by the council, and any such Act might be

¹ See Digest, ss. 45, 47.

² These provisions have been modified by the Act of 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 1). See Digest, s. 60.

³ It had, among other things, discussed the propriety of the grant to the Mysore princes. See Proceedings of Legislative Council for 1860, pp. 1343-1402.

⁴ 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 19. As to the object with which this section was framed, see paragraph 24 of Sir Charles Wood's dispatch of August 9, 1861. The restrictions imposed in 1861 were relaxed in 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 2). Digest, s. 64.

disallowed by the Queen, acting through the Secretary of State.

The legislative power of the Governor-General in Council was declared to extend to making laws and regulations for repealing, amending, or altering any laws or regulations for the time being in force in the 'Indian territories now under the dominion of Her Majesty ¹,' and to making laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all courts of justice, and for all places and things within the said territories, and for all servants of the Government of India within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty ². But there were express savings for certain Parliamentary enactments, for the general authority of Parliament, and for any part of the unwritten laws or constitution of the United Kingdom whereon the allegiance of the subject or the sovereignty of the Crown may depend.

An exceptional power was given to the governor-general, in cases of emergency, to make, without his council, ordinances, which were not to remain in force for more than six months ³.

Doubts had for some time existed as to the proper mode of legislating for newly acquired territories of the Company. When Benares and the territories afterwards known as the North-Western Provinces were annexed, the course adopted was to extend to them, with some variations, the laws and regulations in force in the older provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa. But when the Saugor and Nerbudda territories were acquired from the Marathas by Lord Hastings, and when Assam, Arakan, and Tenasserim were conquered in 1824, and Pegu in 1852, these regions were specially exempted from the Bengal Regulations, instructions, however, being given to the officers administering them to conduct their procedure in accordance with the spirit of the regulations, so

¹ Explained by 55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 3. Digest, s. 63.

² These powers were extended by 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 1, and 32 & 33 Vict. c. 98, s. 1. See Digest, s. 63.

³ See Digest, s. 69.

February 6, 1874; and Notification No. 380, of same date; also Notification No. 2344 of September 12, 1874).

On the other hand, when the chief commissionerships of Oudh, the Central Provinces, and British (now Lower) Burma were constituted out of territories vested in the Governor-General in Council, the procedure was merely the issue of a resolution reciting the reasons for establishing the chief commissionership, defining the territories included in it, and specifying the staff appointed, no reference being made to any statute (Foreign Department letter to Chief Commissioner of Oudh, No. 12, dated February 4, 1856, and Foreign Department Resolution, No. 9, dated November 2, 1861, and No. 212, dated January 31, 1862). In the same way repeated changes have been made by executive orders in the government of the Andaman Islands.

The view taken by the Government of India is that the section does not apply to territories already included in a chief commissionership, this description of territory being, according to the practice of the Indian Legislature, always treated as already under the immediate authority and management of the Governor-General in Council, and therefore not capable of being placed under his authority and management by proclamation. A chief commissioner merely administers territory on behalf of the Governor-General in Council, and the Governor-General in Council does not divest himself of any of his powers in making over the local administration to a chief commissioner.

Although, however, the territory comprised in a chief commissionership may be technically under the immediate authority and management of the Governor-General in Council, yet the chief commissioner would ordinarily be the local Government within the meaning of Act X of 1897, s. 3 (29), and he is defined as a local Government by this Digest.

The result appears to be—

- (1) The section must be used when it is desired to transfer the administration of territory from a governor in council or a lieutenant-governor to a chief commissioner;
- (2) The section need not be used, and is not ordinarily used, when the administration of territory already under the administration of the Governor-General in Council is transferred from one local agency to another.

The transfer of territory under this section does not change the law in force in the territory (see below, s. 58). Consequently supplemental legislation will usually be necessary.

Power to
alter
limits of
provinces.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, s.
38.

57. The Governor-General in Council may, by notification in the Gazette of India, declare, appoint, or alter the boundaries of any of the provinces into which British India is for the time being divided, and distribute the territories of British India among the several provinces thereof in such

of them were transferred to, the regular army under the authority of an Act of that year (24 & 25 Vict. c. 74). Thus the European army of the late East India Company, except a small residue, became merged in the military forces of the Crown¹.

The naval force of the East India Company was not amalgamated with the Royal Navy, but came to an end in 1863, when it was decided that the defence of India against serious attack by sea should be undertaken by the Royal Navy, which was also to provide for the performance of the duties in the Persian Gulf which had been previously undertaken by the Indian Navy².

The change effected by the Government of India Act, 1858, was formally announced in India by the Queen's Proclamation of November 1, 1858.

In 1859 the Government of India Act, 1859 (22 & 23 Vict. c. 41), was passed for determining the officers by whom, and the mode in which, contracts on behalf of the Secretary of State in Council were to be executed in India³.

Three Acts of great importance were passed in the year 1861.

Legisla-
tion of
1861.

Indian
Civil
Service
Act, 1861.

Under the Charter Act of 1793 rank and promotion in the Company's civil service were strictly regulated by seniority, and all offices in the 'civil line' of the Company's service in India under the degree of councillor were strictly reserved to the civil servants of the presidency in which the office was held. But by reason of the exigencies of the public service, numerous civil appointments had been made in

¹ Under existing arrangements all the troops sent to India are placed on the Indian establishment, and from that time cease to be voted on the Army Estimates. The number of the forces in the regular army as fixed by the annual Army Act is declared to be 'exclusive of the number actually serving within Her Majesty's Indian possessions.' As to the constitutionality of employing Indian troops outside India, see the debates of 1878 on the employment of Indian troops in Malta, *Hansard*, cexl. 187, 194, 213, 369, 515; and Anson, *Law and Custom of the Constitution*, pt. ii. p. 361 (2nd ed.).

² See Sir Charles Wood's letter to the Admiralty of Oct. 20, 1862.

³ See Digest, s. 33.

India in disregard of these restrictions. The Indian Civil Service Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 54), validated all these irregular appointments in the past, but scheduled a number of appointments which, in the future, were to be reserved to members of the covenanted civil service¹.

At the same time it abolished the rule as to seniority and removed all statutory restrictions on appointments to offices not in the schedule. And, even with respect to the reserved offices, it left a power of appointing outsiders under exceptional circumstances. This power can only be exercised where it appears to the authority making the appointment that, under the circumstances of the case, it ought to be made without regard to statutory conditions. The person appointed must have resided for at least seven years in India. If the post is in the Revenue or Judicial Departments, the person appointed must pass the same examinations and tests as are required in the case of the covenanted civil service. The appointment is provisional only, and must be forthwith reported to the Secretary of State in Council with the special reasons for making it, and unless approved within twelve months by the Secretary of State it becomes void².

The Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), modified the constitution of the governor-general's executive council and remodelled the Indian legislatures. Indian Councils Act, 1861.

A fifth ordinary member was added to the governor-general's council. Of the five ordinary members, three were required to have served for ten years in India under the Company or the Crown, and one was to be a barrister or advocate of five years' standing. Power was retained to appoint the commander-in-chief an extraordinary member³.

Power was given to the governor-general, in case of his absence from headquarters, to appoint a president of the council, with all the powers of the governor-general except those with respect to legislation. And, in such case, the

¹ This schedule is still in force. Digest, s. 93.

² This provision still exists. Ibid. s. 95.

³ Ibid. 39, 40.

The council was charged with the duty of conducting, under the direction of the Secretary of State, the business transacted in the United Kingdom in relation to the government of India and the correspondence with India. The Secretary of State was to be the president of the council, with power to overrule in case of difference of opinion, and to send, without reference to the council, any dispatches which might under the former practice have been sent through the secret committee ¹.

The officers on the home establishment both of the Company and of the Board of Control were to form the establishment of the new Secretary of State in Council, and a scheme for a permanent establishment was to be submitted.

The patronage of the more important appointments in India was vested either in the Crown or in the Secretary of State in Council. Lieutenant-governors were to be appointed by the governor-general subject to the approval of the Crown.

As under the Act of 1853, admission to the covenanted civil service was to be open to all natural-born subjects of Her Majesty, and was to be granted in accordance with the results of an examination held under rules to be made by the Secretary of State in Council with the assistance of the Civil Service Commissioners.

The patronage to military cadetships was to be divided between the Secretary of State and his council.

The property of the Company was transferred to the Crown. The expenditure of the revenues of India was to be under the control of the Secretary of State in Council, but was to be charged with a dividend on the Company's stock and with their debts, and the Indian revenues remitted to Great Britain were to be paid to the Secretary of State in Council and applied for Indian purposes. Provision was made for the appointment of a special auditor of the accounts of the Secretary of State in Council ².

¹ Digest, ss. 6-14.

Ibid. 22, 30.

CONTENTS

xv

	PAGE
Forgery and perjury	347
Bigamy	<i>ib.</i>
Foreign Enlistment Act	348
Classes of British subjects	<i>ib.</i>
Conclusions as to Parliamentary legislation for extra-territorial offences	350
Foreign Jurisdiction Acts	353
Original of consular jurisdiction. The Capitulations	<i>ib.</i>
The Levant Company	355
Dissolution of Levant Company	356
Difficulties arising from dissolution of Levant Company	357
Failure of Act of 1836; its causes	359
Foreign Jurisdiction Act of 1843	361
Law framed and administered under Foreign Jurisdiction Acts	362
Three stages in history of Acts	<i>ib.</i>
First stage: application to States under regular Governments	<i>ib.</i>
Anomalous position in Egypt	364
Second stage: application to barbarous countries	364
Third stage: application to protectorates	365
Recognition of African protectorates by Berlin Conference	<i>ib.</i>
Charter to German Colonization Society	<i>ib.</i>
Questions as to effect of German charter	366
Questions as to English protectorates in Africa	367
Persons over whom consular jurisdiction is exercisable	370
Consequences of establishment of protectorate	371
Jurisdiction in African protectorates	372
Conclusions as to jurisdiction under Foreign Jurisdiction Acts	376
Application of principles to India	377
Powers of Indian Legislature	378
Liability of British subjects for offences committed out of British India	385
Political Agents to certify fitness of inquiry into charge	<i>ib.</i>
Conclusions as to general powers of Indian Legislature	386
Extra-territorial powers of governor-general in executive capacity	387
Classes of persons to which jurisdiction extends	392
Conclusions as to extra-territorial powers of governor-general	398
INDEX	399

and management ' of the Governor-General in Council within the meaning of the Act of 1854.

The same Act empowered the Government of India, with the sanction of the Home authorities, to define the limits of the several provinces in India; expressly vested in the Governor-General in Council all the residuary authority not transferred to the local Governments of the provinces into which the old Presidency of Bengal had been divided; and directed that the governor-general was no longer to bear the title of governor of that presidency.

The
Govern-
ment of
India Act,
1858.

The Mutiny of 1857 gave the death-blow to the system of 'double government,' with its division of powers and responsibilities. In February, 1858, Lord Palmerston introduced a Bill for transferring the government of India to the Crown. Under his scheme the home administration was to be conducted by a president with the assistance of a council of eight persons. The members of the council were to be nominated by the Crown, were to be qualified either by having been directors of the Company or by service or residence in India, and were to hold office for eight years, two retiring by rotation in each year. In other respects the scheme did not differ materially from that eventually adopted. The cause of the East India Company was pleaded by John Stuart Mill in a weighty State paper, but the second reading of the Bill was carried by a large majority.

Shortly afterwards, however, Lord Palmerston was turned out of office on the Conspiracy to Murder Bill, and was succeeded by Lord Derby, with Mr. Disraeli as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Lord Ellenborough as President of the Board of Control. The Chancellor of the Exchequer promptly introduced a new Bill for the government of India, of which the most remarkable feature was a council consisting partly of nominees of the Crown and partly of persons elected on a complicated and elaborate system, by citizens of Manchester and other large towns, holders of East India stock, and others. This scheme died of ridicule, and when the House assembled

after the Easter recess no one could be found to defend it¹. Mr. Disraeli grasped eagerly at a suggestion by Lord John Russell that the Bill should be laid aside, to be succeeded by another based on resolutions of the House. In the meantime Lord Ellenborough had been compelled to resign in consequence of disapproval of his dispatch censuring Lord Canning's Oudh proclamation, and had been succeeded by Lord Stanley, on whom devolved the charge of introducing and piloting through the House the measure which eventually became law as the Act for the better government of India².

This Act declared that India was to be governed directly by and in the name of the Crown, acting through a Secretary of State, to whom were to be transferred the powers formerly exercised either by the Court of Directors or by the Board of Control. Power was given to appoint a fifth principal Secretary of State for this purpose.

The Secretary of State was to be aided by a council of fifteen members, of whom eight were to be appointed by the Crown and seven elected by the directors of the East India Company. The major part both of the appointed and of the elected members were to be persons who had served or resided in India for ten years, and, with certain exceptions, who had not left India more than ten years before their appointment. Future appointments or elections were to be so made that nine at least of the members of the council should hold these qualifications. The power of filling vacancies was vested in the Crown as to Crown appointments, and in the council itself as to others. The members of the council were to hold office during good behaviour, but to be removable on an address by both Houses of Parliament, and were not to be capable of sitting or voting in Parliament³.

¹ It was to this Bill that Lord Palmerston applied the Spanish boy's remark about Don Quixote, and said that whenever a man was to be seen laughing in the streets he was sure to have been discussing the Government of India Bill.

² 21 & 22 Vict. c. 108.

³ These provisions have been modified by subsequent legislation. See Digest, s. 4.

The Indian Law Commission appointed under the Act of 1833 had ceased to exist before 1853. It seems to have lost much of its vitality after Macaulay's departure from India. It lingered on for many years, published periodically ponderous volumes of reports, on which, in many instances, Indian Acts have been based, but did not succeed in effecting any codification of the laws or customs of the country, and was finally allowed to expire¹. Efforts were, however, made by the Act of 1853 to utilize its labours, and for this purpose power was given to appoint a body of English commissioners, with instructions to examine and consider the recommendations of the Indian Commission².

And, finally, the right of patronage to Indian appointments was by the Act of 1853 taken away from the Court of Directors and directed to be exercised in accordance with regulations framed by the Board of Control. These regulations threw the covenanted civil service open to general competition³.

In 1855 an Act was passed (18 & 19 Vict. c. 53) which prohibited the admission of further students to Haileybury College after January 25, 1856, and directed the college to be closed on January 31, 1858.

Establish-
ment of
chief
commis-
sioner-
ships.

In 1854 was passed an Act⁴ which has had important administrative results in India. Under the old system the

¹ As to the proceedings of the commission, see the evidence given in 1852 before the select committee of the House of Lords on the East India Company's charter by Mr. F. Millett and Mr. Hay Cameron. Mr. Millett was the first secretary, and was afterwards member of the commission. Mr. Cameron was one of the first members of the commission, and was afterwards legislative member of the governor-general's council.

² The commissioners appointed under this power were Sir John (afterwards Lord) Romilly, Sir John Jervis (Chief Justice of Common Pleas), Sir Edward Ryan, C. H. Cameron, J. N. Macleod, J. A. F. Hawkins, Thomas Flower Ellis, and Robert Lowe (Lord Sherbrooke). They were instructed by the Board of Control to consider specially the preparation of a simple and uniform code of procedure for Indian courts, and the amalgamation of the supreme and sader courts. (Letter of November 30, 1853, from the Board of Control to the Indian Law Commission.)

³ They were prepared in 1854 by a committee under the presidency of Lord Macaulay.

⁴ 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77.

only mode of providing for the government of newly acquired territory was by annexing it to one of the three presidencies. Under this system of annexations the Presidency of Bengal had grown to unwieldy dimensions. Some provision had been made for the relief of its government by the constitution of a separate lieutenant-governorship for the North-Western Provinces in 1836. The Act of 1853 had provided for the constitution of a second lieutenant-governorship, and, if necessary, of a fourth presidency. These powers were, however, not found sufficient, and it was necessary to provide for the administration of territories which it might not be advisable to include in any presidency or lieutenant-governorship ¹.

This provision was made by the Act of 1854, which empowered the Governor-General of India in Council, with the sanction of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control, to take by proclamation under his immediate authority and management any part of the territories for the time being in the possession or under the government of the East India Company, and thereupon to give all necessary orders and directions respecting the administration of that part, or otherwise provide for its administration ². The mode in which this power has been practically exercised has been by the appointment of chief commissioners, to whom the Governor-General in Council delegates such powers as need not be reserved to the Central Government. In this way chief commissionerships were established for Assam ³, the Central Provinces, Burma ⁴, and other parts of India. But the title of chief commissioner was not directly recognized by Act of Parliament ⁵, and the territories under the administration of chief commissioners are technically 'under the immediate authority

¹ See preamble to Act of 1854.

² See Digest, s. 50.

³ Assam has now been amalgamated with Eastern Bengal under a lieutenant-governor, and Burma has been constituted a lieutenant-governorship.

⁴ It has since been recognized by the Act of 1870 (33 Vict. c. 32), ss. 1, 3.

The Indian Law Commission appointed under the Act of 1833 had ceased to exist before 1853. It seems to have lost much of its vitality after Macaulay's departure from India. It lingered on for many years, published periodically ponderous volumes of reports, on which, in many instances, Indian Acts have been based, but did not succeed in effecting any codification of the laws or customs of the country, and was finally allowed to expire¹. Efforts were, however, made by the Act of 1853 to utilize its labours, and for this purpose power was given to appoint a body of English commissioners, with instructions to examine and consider the recommendations of the Indian Commission².

And, finally, the right of patronage to Indian appointments was by the Act of 1853 taken away from the Court of Directors and directed to be exercised in accordance with regulations framed by the Board of Control. These regulations threw the covenanted civil service open to general competition³.

In 1855 an Act was passed (18 & 19 Vict. c. 53) which prohibited the admission of further students to Haileybury College after January 25, 1856, and directed the college to be closed on January 31, 1858.

Establish-
ment of
chief
commis-
sioner-
ships.

In 1854 was passed an Act⁴ which has had important administrative results in India. Under the old system the

¹ As to the proceedings of the commission, see the evidence given in 1852 before the select committee of the House of Lords on the East India Company's charter by Mr. F. Millett and Mr. Hay Cameron. Mr. Millett was the first secretary, and was afterwards member of the commission. Mr. Cameron was one of the first members of the commission, and was afterwards legislative member of the governor-general's council.

² The commissioners appointed under this power were Sir John (afterwards Lord) Romilly, Sir John Jervis (Chief Justice of Common Pleas), Sir Edward Ryan, C. H. Cameron, J. N. Macleod, J. A. F. Hawkins, Thomas Flower Ellis, and Robert Lowe (Lord Sherbrooke). They were instructed by the Board of Control to consider specially the preparation of a simple and uniform code of procedure for Indian courts, and the amalgamation of the supreme and sader courts. (Letter of November 30, 1853, from the Board of Control to the Indian Law Commission.)

³ They were prepared in 1854 by a committee under the presidency of Lord Macaulay.

⁴ 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77.

only mode of providing for the government of newly acquired territory was by annexing it to one of the three presidencies. Under this system of annexations the Presidency of Bengal had grown to unwieldy dimensions. Some provision had been made for the relief of its government by the constitution of a separate lieutenant-governorship for the North-Western Provinces in 1836. The Act of 1853 had provided for the constitution of a second lieutenant-governorship, and, if necessary, of a fourth presidency. These powers were, however, not found sufficient, and it was necessary to provide for the administration of territories which it might not be advisable to include in any presidency of lieutenant-governorship ¹.

This provision was made by the Act of 1854, which empowered the Governor-General of India in Council, with the sanction of the Court of Directors and the Board of Control, to take by proclamation under his immediate authority and management any part of the territories for the time being in the possession or under the government of the East India Company, and thereupon to give all necessary orders and directions respecting the administration of that part, or otherwise provide for its administration ². The mode in which this power has been practically exercised has been by the appointment of chief commissioners, to whom the Governor-General in Council delegates such powers as need not be reserved to the Central Government. In this way chief commissioner-ships were established for Assam ³, the Central Provinces, Burma ³, and other parts of India. But the title of chief commissioner was not directly recognized by Act of Parliament ⁴, and the territories under the administration of chief commissioners are technically ' under the immediate authority

¹ See preamble to Act of 1854.

² See Digest, s. 56.

³ Assam has now been amalgamated with Eastern Bengal under a Lieutenant-Governor, and Burma has been constituted a lieutenant-governorship.

⁴ It has since been recognized by the Act of 1870 (33 Viet. c. 3), ss. 1, 3.

manner as may seem expedient, subject to these qualifications. 28 & 29
namely— Vict. c. 17,
ss. 4, 5.]

(1) An entire district may not be transferred from one province to another without the previous sanction of the Crown, signified by the Secretary of State in Council; and

(2) Any notification under this section may be disallowed by the Secretary of State in Council (a).

(a) This section is intended to reproduce the effect of the following enactments :—

3 & 4 WILL. IV, c. 85, s. 38.

‘ It shall be lawful for the said Court of Directors, under the control by this Act provided, and they are hereby required, to declare and appoint what part or parts of any of the territories under the government of the said Company shall from time to time be subject to the government of each of the several presidencies now subsisting or to be established as aforesaid, and from time to time, as occasion may require, to revoke and alter, in the whole or in part, such appointment, and such new distribution of the same, as shall be deemed expedient.’

28 & 29 VICT. c. 17, ss. 4, 5.

‘ It shall be lawful for the Governor-General of India in Council from time to time to declare and appoint, by proclamation, what part or parts of the Indian territories for the time being under the dominion of Her Majesty shall be or continue subject to each of the presidencies and lieutenant-governorships for the time being subsisting in such territories, and to make such distribution and arrangement, or new distribution and arrangement, of such territories into or among such presidencies and lieutenant-governorships as to the said Governor-General in Council may seem expedient.

‘ Provided always, that it shall be lawful for the Secretary of State in Council to signify to the said Governor-General in Council his disallowance of any such proclamation. And provided further, that no such proclamation for the purpose of transferring an entire zillah or district from one presidency to another, or from one lieutenant-governorship to another, shall have any force or validity until the sanction of Her Majesty to the same shall have been previously signified by the Secretary of State in Council to the governor-general.’

The power given by the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 47), would appear from the context to be intended to be exercised for legislative purposes only, and is therefore reproduced below, s. 74. That given by the Act of 1865 (28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 4) is wider. The Government of India were advised in 1878 that the Act of 1865 enables the Governor-General in Council to transfer territory from a chief commissionership to a presidency or lieutenant-governorship,

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF EXISTING LAW

THE administration of British India rests upon English Acts of Parliament, largely supplemented by Indian Acts and regulations¹.

At the head of the administration in England is the Secretary of State, who exercises, on behalf of the Crown, the powers formerly exercised by the Board of Control and Court of Directors, and who, as a member of the Cabinet, is responsible to, and represents the supreme authority of, Parliament².

He is assisted by a council, the Council of India, originally fifteen in number, but now, under an Act of 1889, being gradually reduced to ten. The members of the council are appointed by the Secretary of State, and hold office for a term of ten years, with a power of reappointment under special circumstances for a further term of five years. There is also a special power to appoint any person 'having professional or other peculiar qualifications' to be a member of the council during good behaviour. At least nine members of the council must be persons who have served or resided in British India for not less than ten years, and who have left British India not more than ten years before their appointment. A member of the council cannot sit in Parliament³.

The duties of the Council of India are to conduct, under the direction of the Secretary of State, the business transacted in the United Kingdom in relation to the government of

¹ The best authorities for the existing system of administration are Sir John Strachey's *India* (3rd ed., 1903), Sir W. Hunter's *Indian Empire*, Chesney's *Indian Polity* (3rd ed., 1894), and the latest of the Decennial Reports on the Moral and Material Progress of India (1904).

² Digest, s. 2.

³ Ibid. 2, 3.

India and the correspondence with India. The Secretary of State is president of the council, and has power to appoint a vice-president ¹.

Every order proposed to be made by the Secretary of State must, before it is issued, be either submitted to a meeting of the council or deposited in the council room for seven days before a meeting of the council. But this requirement does not apply to orders which, under the old system, might have been sent through the secret committee ².

In certain matters, including the expenditure of the revenues of India, orders of the Secretary of State are required by law to obtain the concurrence of a majority of votes at a meeting of his council, but in all other matters the Secretary of State can overrule his council. Whenever there has been a difference of opinion in council any member has a right to have his opinion, and the reasons for it, recorded ³.

The council is thus, in the main, a consultative body, without any power of initiation, and with a limited power of veto. Even on questions of expenditure, where they arise out of previous decisions of the Cabinet, as would usually be the case in matters relating to peace or war, or foreign relations, it would be very difficult for the Council to withhold their concurrence from the Secretary of State when he acts as representative and mouthpiece of the Cabinet.

For the better transaction of business the council is divided into committees ⁴.

Staff of
India
Office.

The establishment of the Secretary of State, that is to say the permanent staff constituting what is popularly known as the India Office, was fixed by an Order of the Queen in Council made under the Act of 1858 ⁵. It is divided into departments, each under a separate permanent secretary, and the committees of the council are so formed as to correspond to these departments.

Indian
revenues.

All the revenues of India are required by law to be received

¹ Digest, ss. 5-10.

² Ibid. 12-14.

³ Ibid. 10.

⁴ Ibid. 11.

⁵ Ibid. 18.

PREFACE

THIS is a revised edition of a book which was published in 1898.

In the year 1873 the Secretary of State for India sent to the Government of India the rough draft of a Bill to consolidate the enactments relating to the Government of India. This draft formed the subject of correspondence between the India Office and the Government of India, and an amended draft, embodying several proposals for alteration of the law, was submitted to the India Office by the Government of India in the month of February, 1876. After that date the matter was allowed to drop.

The case for consolidating the English statutes relating to India is exceptionally strong. The Government of India is a subordinate Government, having powers derived from and limited by Acts of Parliament. At every turn it runs the risk of discovering that it has unwittingly transgressed one of the limits imposed on the exercise of its authority. The enactments on which its authority rests range over a period of more than 120 years. Some of these are expressed in language suitable to the time of Warren Hastings, but inapplicable to the India of to-day, and unintelligible except by those who are conversant with the needs and circumstances of the times in which they were passed. In some cases they have been duplicated or triplicated by subsequent enactments, which reproduce with slight modifications, but without express repeal, the provisions of earlier statutes; and the combined effect of the series of enactments is only to be ascertained by a careful study and comparison of the several parts. A consolidating Act would repeal and supersede more than forty separate statutes relating to India.

In England the difficulty of threading the maze of administrative statutes is mitigated by the continuity of administrative tradition. In India there is no similar continuity. The Law Member of Council, on whom the Governor-General is mainly dependent for advice as to the nature and extent of his powers, brings with him from England either no knowledge or a scanty knowledge of Indian administration, and holds

absence
from
Council.
[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
ss. 54, 55-
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 6.]

by order authorize the governor-general alone to exercise, in his discretion, all or any of the powers which might be exercised by the Governor-General in Council at ordinary meetings (a).

(2) The governor-general during absence from his council may, if he thinks it necessary, issue, on his own responsibility, any order which might have been issued by the Governor-General in Council to any local Government, or to any officers or servants of the Crown acting under the authority of any local Government, without previously communicating the order to the local Government, and any such order is of the same force as if made by the Governor-General in Council, but a copy of the order must be sent forthwith to the Secretary of State in Council and to the local Government, with the reasons for making the order.

(3) The Secretary of State in Council may by order suspend until further order all or any of the powers of the governor-general under the last foregoing sub-section, and those powers will accordingly be suspended as from the time of the receipt by the governor-general of the order of the Secretary of State in Council (b).

(a) This provision supplements s. 45.

(b) The provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) are reproduced from ss. 54 and 55 of the Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52). But those sections were enacted in circumstances very different from those of the present time, and are practically superseded by the enactment reproduced in sub-section (1).

War and Treaties.

Restriction on power of Governor-General in Council to make war or treaty.
[33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 42.]

48.—(1) (a) The Governor-General in Council may not, without the express command of the Secretary of State in Council, in any case (except where hostilities have been actually commenced, or preparations for the commencement of hostilities have been actually made against the British Government of India or against any prince or State dependent thereon, or against any prince or State whose territories His Majesty has engaged by any subsisting treaty to defend or

'General Society entitled to the advantages given by an Act of Parliament for advancing a sum not exceeding two millions for the service of the Crown of England.' The Act follows closely the lines of that by which, four years before, Montagu had established the Bank of England in consideration of a loan of £1,200,000. In each case the loan bears interest at the rate of 8 per cent., and is secured on the proceeds of a special tax or set of taxes. In each case the subscribers to the loan are incorporated and obtain special privileges. The system was an advance on that under which bodies of merchants had obtained their privileges by means of presents to the king or bribes to his ministers, and was destined to receive much development in the next generation. The plan of raising special loans on the security of special taxes has since been superseded by the National Debt and the Consolidated Fund. But the debt to the Bank of England still remains separate, and retains some of the features originally imprinted on it by the legislation of Montagu.

✓ Of the charters granted under the Act of 1698, the first¹ incorporated the General Society as a regulated company, whilst the second² incorporated most of the subscribers to the General Society as a joint-stock company, under the name of 'The English Company trading to the East Indies.' The constitution of the English Company was formed on the same general lines as that of the Old or London Company, but the members of their governing body were called directors instead of 'committees.'

The New Company were given the exclusive privilege of trading to the East Indies, subject to a reservation of the concurrent rights of the Old Company until September 29, 1701. The New Company, like the Old Company, were authorized to make by-laws and ordinances, to appoint governors, with power to raise and train military forces, and to establish courts of judicature. They were also directed to maintain ministers of religion at their factories in India, and

¹ Charter of September 3, 1698.

² Charter of September 5, 1698.

- 63.**—(1) The Governor-General in Council has power at legislative meetings to make laws (*a*)—
- (*a*) for all persons, for all courts, and for all places and things within British India (*b*) ; and
 - (*b*) for all British subjects of His Majesty and servants of the Government of India within other parts of India (*c*) ; and
 - (*c*) for all persons being native Indian subjects of His Majesty or native Indian officers, soldiers, or followers in His Majesty's Indian forces, when respectively in any part of the world; whether within or without His Majesty's dominions (*d*) ; and
 - (*d*) for all persons employed or serving in or belonging to His Majesty's Indian Marine Service (*e*) ; and
 - (*e*) for repealing or altering any laws or regulations for the time being in force in any part of British India [or over any persons for whom the Governor-General in Council has power to make laws] (*f*).
- (2) Provided that the Governor-General in Council has not power to make any law repealing or affecting (*g*)—
- (*a*) any provisions of the Government of India Act, 1833, except sections eighty-one, eighty-two, eighty-three, eighty-four, eighty-five, and eighty-six of that Act, or any provisions of the Government of India Act, 1853, or the Government of India Act, 1854, or the Government of India Act, 1858, or the Government of India Act, 1859, or the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (*h*) ; or
 - (*b*) any Act of Parliament passed after the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty, and extending to British India (*i*) ; or
 - (*c*) any Act enabling the Secretary of State in Council to raise money in the United Kingdom for the government of India ; or
 - (*d*) the Army Act (*j*), or any Act amending the same ;
- and has not power to make any law affecting the authority of Parliament (*k*), or any part of the unwritten laws or con-

Legis-
lative
power of
Governor-
General in
Council.
[3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, ss.
46, 51, 73.
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 22.
28 & 29
Vict. c.
17, ss. 1, 2.
32 & 33
Vict. c.
98, s. 1.
33 & 34
Vict. c.
3, s. 2.
47 & 48
Vict. c.
38, ss. 2,
3, 5.
55 & 56
Vict. c.
14, s. 3.]

3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85.
16 & 17
Vict. c. 95.
17 & 18
Vict. c. 77.
21 & 22
Vict. c.
106.
22 & 23
Vict. c. 46.
24 & 25
Vict. c. 67.

of the Court of Directors, to declare any such part open, and remove the obligation of a licence.

Another section expressly enabled any natural-born subject of the Crown to acquire and hold lands in India.

The regulations as to licences have long since been abolished or fallen into desuetude. But by s. 84 of the Act of 1833 the Governor-General in Council was required, as soon as conveniently might be, to make laws or regulations providing for the prevention or punishment of the illicit entrance into or residence in British India of persons not authorized to enter or reside therein. Effect has been given to this requirement by Act III of 1864, under which the Government of India and local Governments can order foreigners to remove themselves from British India, and apprehend and detain them if they refuse to obey the order. Under the same Act the Governor-General in Council can apply to British India, or any part thereof, special provisions as to the reporting and licensing of foreigners ¹.

An echo of the fears expressed in 1813 as to the dangers likely to arise from the free settlement of interlopers is to be found in the section which, after reciting that 'the removal of restrictions on the intercourse of Europeans with the said territories will render it necessary to provide for any mischief or dangers that may arise therefrom,' requires the Governor-General in Council, by laws and regulations, to provide, with all convenient speed, for the protection of the natives of the said territories from insult and outrage in their persons, religions, and opinions ².

Section 87 of the Act declared that 'no native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty resident therein, shall, by reason only of his religion, place

¹ See *Alter Kaufman v. Government of Bombay*, [1894] I. L. R. 18 Bombay, 636. As to the general powers of excluding aliens from British territory, see *Musgrove v. Chun Teong Toy*, [1891] L. R. A. C. 272 (exclusion of Chinese from Australia), and an article in the *Law Quarterly Review* for 1897 on 'Alien Legislation and the Prerogative of the Crown.'

² See ss. 295-298 of the Indian Penal Code.

operation, but the power of appointing a lieutenant-governor was exercised in 1854, and has been continued ever since.

By the following section, power was given to the directors either to constitute one new presidency, with the same system of a governor and council as in the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay, or, as an alternative, to authorize the appointment of a lieutenant-governor. In this case also the former power was never exercised, but a new lieutenant-governorship was created for the Punjab in 1850.

Further alterations were made by the Act of 1853 in the machinery for Indian legislation. The 'fourth' or legislative member of the governor-general's council was placed on the same footing with the older or 'ordinary' members of the council by being given a right to sit and vote at executive meetings. At the same time the council was enlarged for legislative purposes by the addition of legislative members, of whom two were the Chief Justice of Bengal and one other supreme court judge, and the others were Company's servants of ten years' standing appointed by the several local Governments. The result was that the council as constituted for legislative purposes under the Act of 1853 consisted of twelve¹ members, namely—

The governor-general.

The commander-in-chief.

The four ordinary members of the governor-general's council.

The Chief Justice of Bengal.

A puisne judge.

Four representative members (paid)² from Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North-Western Provinces.

The sittings of the legislative council were made public and their proceedings were officially published.

¹ Power was given by the Act of 1853 to the governor-general to appoint, with the sanction of the Home Government, two other members from the civil service, but this power was never exercised.

² They received salaries of £5,000 a year each.

There was also an express saving of the right of Parliament to legislate for India and to repeal Indian Acts, and, the better to enable Parliament to exercise this power, all Indian laws were to be laid before Parliament.

Laws made under the powers given by the Act were to be subject to disallowance by the Court of Directors, acting under the Board of Control, but, when made, were to have effect as Acts of Parliament, and were not to require registration or publication in any court of justice.

The laws made under the Act of 1833 were known as Acts, and took the place of the 'regulations' made under previous Acts of Parliament.

A comprehensive consolidation and codification of Indian laws was contemplated. Section 53 of the Act recited that it was 'expedient that, subject to such special arrangements as local circumstances may require, a general system of judicial establishments and police, to which all persons whatsoever, as well Europeans as natives, may be subject, should be established in the said territories at an early period; and that such laws as may be applicable in common to all classes of the inhabitants of the said territories, due regard being had to the rights, feelings, and peculiar usages of the people, should be enacted; and that all laws and customs having the force of law within the same territories should be ascertained and consolidated, and, as occasion may require, amended.'

The Act then went on to direct the Governor-General in Council to issue a commission, to be known as the 'Indian Law Commission,' which was to inquire into the jurisdiction, powers, and rules of the existing courts of justice and police establishments in the Indian territories, and all existing forms of judicial procedure, and into the nature and operation of all laws, whether civil or criminal, written or customary, prevailing and in force in any part of the Indian territories, to which any inhabitants of those territories were then sub-

ject. The commissioners were to report to the Governor-General in Council, setting forth the results of their inquiries, and suggesting alterations, and these reports were to be laid before Parliament.

This was the first Indian Law Commission, of which Macaulay was the most prominent member¹. Its labours resulted directly in the preparation of the Indian Penal Code, which however did not become law until 1860, and, indirectly and after a long interval of time, in the preparation of the Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure and other codes of substantive and adjective law which now form part of the Indian Statute Book.

Important provisions were made by the Act of 1833 for enlarging the rights of European settlers, and for protecting the natives of the country, and ameliorating their condition.

It was declared to be lawful for any natural-born subject of His Majesty to proceed by sea to any port or place having a custom-house establishment within the Indian territories, and to reside thereat, or to proceed to and reside in or pass through any part of the territories which were under the Company's government on January 1, 1800, or any part of the countries ceded by the Nabob of the Carnatic, of the province of Cuttaek, or of the settlements of Singapore and Malacca. These rights might be exercised without the requirement of any licence. But every subject of His Majesty not being a native was, on his arrival in India from abroad, to signify on entry, to an officer of customs, his name, place of destination, and objects of pursuit in India. A licence was still required for residence in any part of India other than those above mentioned, but power was reserved to the Governor-General in Council, with the previous approbation

¹ His colleagues were another English barrister, Mr. Cameron, afterwards law member of council, and two civil servants of the Company, Mr. Macleod of the Madras Service, and Mr. (afterwards Sir William) Anderson of the Bombay Service. Sir William Macnaghten of the Bengal Service was also appointed, but did not accept the appointment.

Company's ships within the limits of their charter, with power for their naval officers to raise naval forces, and to exercise and use 'within their ships on the other side of the Cape of Good Hope, in the time of open hostility with some other nation, the law called the law martial for defence of their ships against the enemy.' By the same charter the Company were empowered to coin in their forts any species of money usually coined by native princes, and it was declared that these coins were to be current within the bounds of the charter.

The provisions of the charter of 1683 with respect to the Company's admiralty court were repeated with some modifications, and under these provisions Sir John Biggs, who had been recorder of Portsmouth, was appointed judge-advocate at Madras.

Among the prerogatives of the Crown one of the most important is the power of constituting municipal corporations by royal charter. Therefore it was a signal mark of royal favour when James II, in 1687, delegated to the East India Company the power of establishing by charter a municipality at Madras. The question whether this charter should be passed under the great seal or under the Company's seal was discussed at a cabinet council. The latter course was eventually adopted at the instance of the governor and deputy governor of the Company, and the reasons urged for its adoption are curious and characteristic. The governor expressed his opinion that no persons in India should be employed under immediate commission from His Majesty, 'because the wind of extraordinary honour in their heads would probably render them so haughty and overbearing that the Company would be forced to remove them.' He was evidently thinking of the recent differences between Sir John Child and Dr. St. John, and was alive to the dangers arising from an independent judiciary which in the next century were to bring about the conflicts between Warren Hastings and the Calcutta supreme court.

Establishment of municipality at Madras.

at least, in the presidency towns. Secondly, all English Acts subsequent to that date, which were expressly extended to any part of India. Thirdly, the regulations of the governor-general's council, which commence with the Revised Code of 1793, containing forty-eight regulations, all passed on the same day (which embraced the results of twelve years' antecedent legislation), and were continued down to the year 1834. They only had force in the territories of Bengal. Fourthly, the regulations of the Madras council, which spread over the period of thirty-two years, from 1802 to 1834, and are [were] in force in the Presidency of Fort St. George. Fifthly, the regulations of the Bombay Code, which began with the revised code of Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone in 1827, comprising the results of twenty-eight years' previous legislation, and were also continued into 1834, having force and validity in the Presidency of Fort St. David¹.

'In 1833,' says Mr. Cowell in continuation, 'the attention of Parliament was directed to three leading vices in the process of Indian government. The first was in the nature of the laws and regulations; the second was in the ill defined authority and power from which these various laws and regulations emanated; and the third was the anomalous and sometimes conflicting judicatures by which the laws were administered.'

The Act of 1833 vested the legislative power of the Indian Government exclusively in the Governor-General in Council, who had been, as has been seen, reinforced by the addition of a fourth legislative member. The four Presidential Governments were merely authorized to submit to the Governor-General in Council 'drafts or projects of any laws or regulations which they might think expedient,' and the Governor-General in Council was required to take these drafts and projects into consideration and to communicate his resolutions thereon to the Government proposing them.

¹ Cowell, *Tagore Lectures* of 1872. For 'Fort St. David' read 'Bombay.' See also Harington's *Analysis of the Bengal Regulations*.

The Governor-General in Council was expressly empowered to make laws and regulations—

- (a) for repealing, amending, or altering any laws or regulations whatever, for the time being in force in the Indian territories ;
- (b) for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all courts of justice, whether established by charter or otherwise, and the jurisdiction thereof ;
- (c) for all places and things whatsoever within and throughout the whole and every part of the said territories.
- (d) for all servants of the Company within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with the Company ; and
- (e) as articles of war for the government of the native officers and soldiers in the military service of the Company, and for the administration of justice by courts-martial to be holden on such officers and soldiers.

But this power was not to extend to the making of any laws and regulations—

- (i) which should repeal, vary, or suspend any of the provisions of the Act of 1833, or of the Acts for punishing mutiny and desertion of officers and soldiers in the service of the Crown or of the Company ; or
- (ii) which should affect any prerogative of the Crown, or the authority of Parliament, or the constitution or rights of the Company, or any part of the unwritten laws or constitutions of the United Kingdom, whereon may depend the allegiance of any person to the Crown, or the sovereignty or dominion of the Crown over the Indian territories ; or
- (iii) without the previous sanction of the Court of Directors, which should empower any court other than a chartered court to sentence to death any of His Majesty's natural-born subjects born in Europe, or their children, or abolish any of the chartered courts¹.

¹ See Digest, s. 63.

The Company were required to close their commercial business and to wind up their affairs with all convenient speed. Their territorial and other debts were charged on the revenues of India, and they were to receive out of those revenues an annual dividend at the rate of £10 10s. per cent. on the whole amount of their capital stock (i. e. £6,30,000 a year), but this dividend was to be subject to redemption by Parliament on payment of £200 sterling for every £100 stock, and for the purpose of this redemption a sum of two million pounds was to be paid by the Company to the National Debt Commissioners and accumulated with compound interest until it reached the sum of twelve millions¹.

The Company, while deprived of their commercial functions, retained their administrative and political powers, under the system of double government instituted by previous Acts, and, in particular, continued to exercise their rights of patronage over Indian appointments. The constitution of the Board of Control was modified, but as the powers of the Board were executed by its president the modifications had no practical effect. The Act re-enacted provisions of former Acts as to the 'secret committee' of the Court of Directors, and the dispatches to be sent through that committee, and it simplified the formal title of the Company by authorizing it to be called the East India Company.

No very material alteration was made in the system on which the executive government was to be carried on in India.

The superintendence, direction, and control of the whole civil and military government were expressly vested in a governor-general and councillors, who were to be styled 'the Governor-General of India in Council'.² This council was increased by the addition of a fourth ordinary member,

¹ As to the financial arrangements made under these provisions, see the evidence of Mr. Melvill before the Lords Committee of 1852.

² It will be remembered that the Governor-General had been previously the Governor-General of Bengal in Council.

who was not to be one of the Company's servants, and was not to be entitled to act as member of council except for legislative purposes¹. It need hardly be stated that the fourth member was Macaulay.

The overgrown Presidency of Bengal² was to be divided into two distinct presidencies, to be called the Presidency of Fort William and the Presidency of Agra. But this provision never came into operation. It was suspended by an enactment of 1835 (5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52), and the suspension was continued indefinitely by the Charter Act of 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 15).

The intention was that each of the four presidencies, Fort William, Fort St. George, Bombay, and Agra, should have, for executive purposes, a governor and council of its own. But the governor-general and his council were to be, for the present, the governor and council of Fort William, and power was given to reduce the members of the council, or even suspend them altogether and vest the executive control in a governor alone³.

Important alterations were made by the Act of 1833 in the legislative powers of the Indian Government. 'At that date there were five different bodies of statute law in force in the (Indian) empire. First, there was the whole body of statute law existing so far as it was applicable, which was introduced by the Charter of George I and which applied,

¹ 'The duty of the fourth ordinary member' (under the Act of 1833) 'was confined entirely to the subject of legislation; he had no power to sit or vote except at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations; and it was only by courtesy, and not by right, that he was allowed to see the papers or correspondence, or to be made acquainted with the deliberations of Government upon any subject not immediately connected with legislation.' Minute by Sir Barnes Peacock of November 3, 1859.

² It had been increased by the addition of Benares in 1775, of the modern Orissa in 1803, of large territories in the North-West in 1801-1803, and of Assam, Arakan, and Tenasserim in 1824.

³ The power of reduction was exercised in 1833 by reducing the number of ordinary members of the Madras and Bombay councils from three to two (Political Dispatch of December 27, 1833). The original intention was to abolish the councils of the minor presidencies, but, at the instance of the Court of Directors, their retention was left optional.

An Act of 1815¹ gave power to extend the limits of the presidency towns, and amended some of the minor provisions of the Act of 1813.

An Act of 1818² removed doubts as to the validity of certain Indian marriages, a subject which has always presented much difficulty, but which has now been dealt with by Indian legislation³.

An Act of 1820⁴ enabled the East India Company to raise and maintain a corps of volunteer infantry.

An Act of 1823⁵ charged the revenues of India with the payment of additional sums for the pay and pensions of troops serving in India, and regulated the pensions of Indian bishops and archdeacons, and the salaries and pensions of the judges of the supreme courts.

The same Act authorized the grant of a charter for a supreme court of Bombay in substitution for the recorder's court.

The prohibition on settling in India without a licence was still retained. But restrictions on Indian trade were gradually removed, and a consolidating Act of 1823⁶ expressly declared that trade might be carried on in British vessels with all places within the limits of the Company's charter except China.

Another Act of 1823⁷ consolidated and amended the laws for punishing mutiny and desertion of officers and soldiers in the Company's service.

An Act of 1824⁸ transferred the island of Singapore to the East India Company.

Acts of 1825⁹ and 1826¹⁰ further regulated the salaries of Indian judges and bishops, and regulated the appointment of juries in the presidency towns.

¹ 55 Geo. III, c. 84.

² See Acts III & XV of 1872.

³ 4 Geo. IV, c. 71.

⁴ 4 Geo. IV, c. 81.

⁵ 5 Geo. IV, c. 108.

⁶ Singapore was placed under the Colonial Office by the Straits Settlements Act, 1866 (29 & 30 Vict. c. 113, s. 1).

⁹ 6 Geo. IV, c. 85.

⁷ 53 Geo. III, c. 84.

⁸ 1 Geo. IV, c. 69.

⁹ 4 Geo. IV, c. 70.

¹⁰ 7 Geo. IV, c. 37.

An Act of 1828¹ declared the real estates of British subjects dying within the jurisdiction of the supreme courts at the presidency towns to be liable for payment of their debts. Other Acts of the same year applied the East India Mutiny Act to the force known as the Bombay Marine², and extended to the East Indies sundry amendments of the English criminal law³.

And an Act of 1832⁴ authorized the appointment of persons other than covenanted civilians to be justices of the peace in India, and repealed the provisions requiring jurors to be Christians.

When the time came round again for renewing the Company's charter, Lord William Bentinck's peaceful *régime* had lasted for five years in India; the Reform Act had just been carried in England, and Whig principles were in the ascendant. Bentham's views on legislation and codification were exercising much influence on the minds of law reformers. Macanlay was in Parliament, and was secretary to the Board of Control, and James Mill, Bentham's disciple, was the examiner of India correspondence at the India House. The Charter Act of 1833⁵, like that of 1813, was preceded by careful inquiries into the administration of India. It introduced important changes into the constitution of the East India Company and the system of Indian administration.

The territorial possessions of the Company were allowed to remain under their government for another term of twenty years; but were to be held by the Company 'in trust for His Majesty, his heirs and successors, for the service of the Government of India.'

The Company's monopoly of the China trade, and of the tea trade, was finally taken away.

¹ 9 Geo. IV, c. 33.

² 9 Geo. IV, c. 74.

³ 9 Geo. IV, c. 72.

⁴ 2 & 3 Will. IV, c. 117.

⁵ 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85. The Act received the Royal Assent on August 28, 1833, but did not come into operation, except as to appointments and the like, until April 22, 1834 (s. 117).

The thirty-third section recites the thirteenth resolution, and the expediency of making provision for granting permission to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India, for the purposes mentioned in the resolution (missionaries) 'and for other lawful purposes' (traders), and then enables the Court of Directors or, on their refusal, the Board of Control, to grant licences and certificates entitling the applicants to proceed to any of the principal settlements of the Company, and to remain in India as long as they conduct themselves properly, but subject to such restrictions as may for the time being be judged necessary. Unlicensed persons are to be liable to the penalties imposed by earlier Acts on interlopers, and to punishment on summary conviction in India. British subjects allowed to reside more than ten miles from a presidency town are to procure and register certificates from a direct court.

A group of sections relates to the provision for religion, learning, and education, and the training of the Company's civil and military servants. There is to be a Bishop of Calcutta, with three archdeacons under him. The colleges at Calcutta and elsewhere are placed under the regulations of the Board of Control. One lac of rupees in each year is to be 'set apart and applied to the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of the learned native of India, and for the introduction and promotion of a knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories in India.' The college at Haileybury and the military seminary at Addiscombe¹ are to be maintained, and no person is to be appointed writer unless he has resided four terms at Haileybury, and produces a certificate that he has conformed to the regulations of the college.

Then come provisions for the application of the revenues², for keeping the commercial and territorial accounts distinct,

¹ The names of these places are not mentioned.

² An interesting discussion of these provisions is to be found in the correspondence of 1833 between Mr. Charles Grant and the Court of Directors. According to Mr. Grant the principle established by the Acts of 1793 and 1813 was that the profit accruing from the Company's commerce should,

CONTENTS

viii

SECTION	<i>Jurisdiction.</i>	PAGE
101.	Jurisdiction of high courts	239
102.	Powers of high courts with respect to subordinate courts	245
103.	Exercise of jurisdiction by single judges or division courts	246
104.	Power for Governor-General in Council to alter local limits of jurisdiction of high courts	ib.
105.	Exemption from jurisdiction of high court in public capacity	247
106.	Written order by governor-general a justification for any act in any court in India	248
107.	Procedure in case of oppression, &c., by governor-general or his council	ib.

Law to be administered.

108.	Law to be administered in cases of inheritance and succession	249
------	---	-----

Advocate-General.

109.	Appointment and powers of advocate-general	251
------	--	-----

PART X.

ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT.

110.	Jurisdiction of Indian bishops	252
111.	Power to admit to holy orders	ib.
112.	Consecration of person resident in India appointed to bishopric	254
113.	Salaries and allowances of bishops and archdeacons	ib.
114.	Furlough rules	254
115.	Establishment of chaplains of Church of Scotland	ib.
116.	Saving as to grants to Christians	ib.

PART XI.

OFFENCES, PENALTIES, AND PROCEDURE.

117.	Certain acts to be misdemeanours: Oppression. Willful disobedience. Breach of duty. Trading. Receiving presents	255
118.	Loans to native princes	256
119.	Prosecution of offences in England	257
120.	Provision as to persons suspected of dangerous correspondence	258

PART XII.

SUPPLEMENTAL.

121.	Saving as to certain rights and powers	260
122.	Treaties, contracts, and liabilities of East India Company	ib.
123.	Orders of East India Company	261
124.	Definitions	ib.

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTES	262
------------------------------	-----

SCHEDULES :—

I. Official salaries	272
--------------------------------	-----

II. Offices reserved to the Civil Service of India	ib.
--	-----

TABLE OF COMPARISON BETWEEN STATUTORY ENACTMENTS AND DIGEST	274
---	-----

The fourth and fifth regulated the application of the Company's territorial revenues and commercial profits.

The sixth provided for the reduction of the Company's debt, for the payment of a dividend at the rate of $10\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, and for the division of any surplus between the Company and the public in the proportion of one-sixth to the former and five-sixths to the latter.

The seventh required the Company to keep their accounts in such manner as to distinguish clearly those relating to the territorial and political departments from those relating to the commercial branch of their affairs.

The eighth affirmed the expediency, in the interests of economy, of limiting the grants of salaries and pensions.

The ninth reserved to the Court of Directors the right of appointment to the offices of governor-general, governor, and commander-in-chief, subject to the approbation of the Crown.

Under the tenth, the number of the king's troops in India was to be limited, and any number exceeding the limit was, unless employed at the express requisition of the Company, to be at the public charge. This modified, in a sense favourable to the Company, Pitt's declaratory Act of 1788.

Then followed a resolution that it was expedient that the church establishment in the British territories in the East Indies should be placed under the superintendence of a bishop and three archdeacons, and that adequate provision should be made from the territorial revenues of India for their maintenance.

The twelfth resolution declared that the regulations to be framed by the Court of Directors for the colleges at Haileybury and Addiscombe ought to be subject to the regulation of the Board of Control, and that the Board ought to have power to send instructions to India about the colleges at Calcutta¹ and Madras.

¹ The college at Calcutta had been founded by Lord Wellesley for the training of the Company's civil servants.

It was round the thirteenth resolution that the main controversy raged, and its vague and guarded language shows the difficulty that was experienced in settling its terms. The resolution declared 'that it is the duty of this country to promote the interest and happiness of the native inhabitants of the British dominions in India, and that such measures ought to be adopted as may tend to the introduction amongst them of useful knowledge, and of religious and moral improvement. That in the furtherance of the above objects, sufficient facilities shall be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the purpose of accomplishing these benevolent designs, provided always, that the authority of the local Governments, respecting the intercourse of Europeans with the interior of the country, be preserved, and that the principles of the British Government, on which the natives of India have hitherto relied for the free exercise of their religion, be inviolably maintained.' One discerns the planter following in the wake of the missionary, each watched with a jealous eye by the Company's servants.

The principles embodied in the Resolutions of 1813 were developed in the Act of the same year¹. The language of the preamble to the Act is significant. It recites the expediency of continuing to the Company for a further term the possession of the territorial acquisitions in India, and the revenues thereof, 'without prejudice to the undoubted sovereignty of the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in and over the same².' The constitutional controversy of the preceding century was not to be reopened.

The Act then grants the Indian possessions and revenues to the Company for a further term of twenty years, reserves to them for the same time the China trade and the tea trade, but throws open the general India trade, subject to various restrictive conditions.

¹ 55 Geo. III, c. 155.

² The sovereignty of the Crown had been clearly reserved in the charter of 1698. But at that time the territorial possessions were insignificant.

but does not allow the converse. Parliament, it was thought, having enacted 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 3, must be taken to have been aware of the existence of territories called chief commissionerships, and to have deliberately omitted any mention of these in the Act of 1865.

On April 24, 1883, a proclamation was issued under 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 4, placing the villages of Shaikh-Othman and Imad, near Aden, under the Government of Bombay. The section has since then been applied to Perim.

Saving as
to laws.
[17 & 18
Vict. c.
77, s. 3.
24 & 25
Vict. c. 67,
s. 47.]

58. An alteration in pursuance of the foregoing provisions of the mode of administration of any part of British India, or of the boundaries of any part of British India, does not affect the law for the time being in force in that part.

The power to take territory under the immediate authority of the Governor-General in Council (reproduced by s. 56 above) is qualified by the proviso that no law or regulation in force at any such time as regards any such portions of territory shall be altered or repealed except by law or regulation made by the Governor-General of India in Council (17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 3).

The power to fix the limits of a province given by 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 47, and reproduced by s. 57 above, is qualified by a similar proviso, 'that any law or regulation made by the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any presidency, division, province, or territory shall continue in force in any part thereof which may be severed therefrom by any such proclamation, until superseded by law or regulation of the Governor-General in Council, or of the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the presidency, division, province, or territory to which such parts have become annexed.'

The power exercisable under 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17, s. 4, is not qualified by a similar proviso.

Power to
extend
bounda-
ries of
presi-
dency
towns.
[55 Geo.
III, c. 84,
s. 1.]

59. The Governor-General in Council, the Governor of Madras in Council, and the Governor of Bombay in Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, extend the limits of the towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay respectively; and any Act of Parliament, charter, law, or usage having effect only within the limits of those towns respectively will have effect within the limits as so extended.

This power, which was given by an Act of 1815, appears to be still in force, and not to be superseded by the later enactments reproduced above.

political dangers which would arise from an unlimited resort of Europeans to India. The venerable Warren Hastings was called from his retreat to support on this point the views of the Company before the House of Commons, and it was on this occasion that the members testified their respect for him by rising as a body on his entrance into the House and standing until he had assumed his seat within the bar. His evidence confirmed the assertions of the Company as to the danger of unrestricted European immigration into India, and was supplemented by evidence to a similar effect from Lord Teignmouth (Sir J. Shore), Colonel (Sir John) Malcolm, and Colonel (Sir Thomas) Munro. Experience had proved, they affirmed, that it was difficult to impress even upon the servants of the Company, whilst in their noviciate, a due regard for the feelings and habits of the people, and Englishmen of classes less under the observation of the supreme authorities were notorious for the contempt with which, in their natural arrogance and ignorance, they contemplated the usages and institutions of the natives, and for their frequent disregard of the dictates of humanity and justice in their dealings with the people of India. The natives, although timid and feeble in some places, were not without strength and resolution in others, and instances had occurred where their resentment had proved formidable to their oppressors. It was difficult, if not impossible, to afford them protection, for the Englishman was amenable only to the courts of British law established at the presidencies, and although the local magistrate had the power of sending him further for trial, yet to impose upon the native complainant and witness the obligation of repairing many hundred miles to obtain redress was to subject them to delay, fatigue, and expense, which would be more intolerable than the injury they had suffered.

That their apprehensions were unfounded no one who is acquainted with the history or present conditions of British India would venture to deny. But they were expressed by

the advocates of the Company in language of unjustifiable intemperance and exaggeration. Thus Mr. Charles Grant, in the course of the debate in the House of Commons, dwelt on the danger of letting loose among the people of India a host of desperate needy adventurers, whose atrocious conduct in America and in Africa afforded sufficient indication of the evil they would inflict upon India.

The controversy was eventually compromised by allowing Europeans to resort to India, but only under a strict system of licences.

Closely connected with the question of the admission of independent Europeans into India was that of missionary enterprise. The Government were willing to take steps for the recognition and encouragement of Christianity by the appointment of a bishop and archdeacons. But a large number of excellent men, belonging mainly to the Evangelical party, and led in the House of Commons by Wilberforce, were anxious to go much further in the direction of committing the Indian Government to the active propagation of Christianity among the natives of India. On the other hand, the past and present servants of the Company, including even those who, like Lord Teignmouth, were personally in sympathy with the Evangelical school, were fully sensitive to the danger of interfering with the religious convictions or alarming the religious prejudices of the natives.

The proposals ultimately submitted by the Government to Parliament in 1813 were embodied in thirteen resolutions¹.

The first affirmed the expediency of extending the Company's privileges, subject to modifications, for a further term of twenty years.

The second preserved to the Company the monopoly of the China trade and of the trade in tea.

The third threw open to all British subjects the export and import trade with India, subject to the exception of tea, and to certain safeguards as to warehousing and the like.

¹ Printed in an appendix to vol. vii. of Mill and Wilson's *British India*.

to be sent to the Court of Directors and to the Board of Control¹.

An Act of 1799² gave the Company further powers for raising European troops and maintaining discipline among them. Under this Act the Crown took the enlistment of men for serving in India into its own hands, and, on petition from the Company, transferred recruits to them at an agreed sum per head for the cost of recruiting. Authority was given to the Company to train and exercise recruits, not exceeding 2,000, and to appoint officers for that purpose (bearing also His Majesty's commission) at pay not exceeding the sums stated in the Act. The number which the Crown could hold for transfer to the Company was limited to 3,000 men, or such a number as the Mutiny Act for the time being should specify. All the men raised were liable to the Mutiny Act until embarked for India.

An Act of 1800³ provided for the constitution of a supreme court at Madras, and extended the jurisdiction of the supreme court at Calcutta over the district of Benares (which had been ceded in 1775) and all other districts which had been or might thereafter be annexed to the Presidency of Bengal.

An Act of 1807⁴ gave the governors and councils at Madras and Bombay the same powers of making regulations, subject to approval and registration by the supreme court and recorder's court, as had been previously vested in the Government of Bengal, and the same power of appointing justices of the peace.

Charter
Act of
1813.

The legislation of 1813 was of a very different character from that of 1793. It was preceded by the most searching investigation which had yet taken place into Indian affairs. The vigorous policy of annexation carried on by Lord

¹ See Harington's *Analysis*, 1-9.

² 39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 109. See Clode, *Military Forces of the Crown*, 1, 280.

³ 39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79. The charter under this Act was granted in December, 1801. Bombay did not acquire a supreme court until 1823 (3 Geo. IV, c. 71).

⁴ 47 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 68.

Wellesley during his seven years' tenure of office (1798-1805) had again involved the Company in financial difficulties, and in 1808 a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire, amongst other things, into the conditions on which relief should be granted. It continued its sittings over the four following years, and the famous Fifth Report, which was published in July, 1812, is still a standard authority on Indian land tenures, and the best authority on the judicial and police arrangements of the time. When the time arrived for taking steps to renew the Company's charter, a Dundas¹ was still at the Board of Control, but it was no longer found possible to avoid the questions which had been successfully shirked in 1793. Napoleon had closed the European ports, and British traders imperatively demanded admission to the ports of Asia. At the end of 1811 Lord Melville told the Court of Directors that His Majesty's ministers could not recommend to Parliament the continuance of the existing system unless they were prepared to agree that the ships, as well as goods, of private merchants should be admitted into the trade with India under such restrictions as might be deemed reasonable.

The Company struggled hard for their privileges. They began by arguing that their political authority and commercial privileges were inseparable, that their trade profits were dependent upon their monopoly, and that if their trade profits were taken away their revenues would not enable them to carry on the government of the country. But their accounts had been kept in such a fashion as to leave it very doubtful whether their trade profits, as distinguished from their territorial revenues, amounted to anything at all. And this ground of argument was finally cut from under their feet by the concession of a continued monopoly of the tea trade, from which it was admitted that the commercial profits of the Company were principally, if not wholly, derived.

Driven from this position the Company dwelt on the

¹ Robert Dundas, who, on his father's death in 1811, became the second Viscount Melville.

officers and soldiers in the military service of the Company, and for the administration of justice by courts-martial to be holden on such officers and soldiers, and such articles of war from time to time to repeal or vary and amend; and such articles of war shall be made and taken notice of in the same manner as all other the laws and regulations to be made by the said Governor-General in Council under this Act, and shall prevail and be in force, and shall be of exclusive authority over all the native officers and soldiers in the said military service, to whatever presidency such officers and soldiers may belong, or wherever they may be serving: Provided nevertheless, that until such articles of war shall be made by the said Governor-General in Council, any articles of war for or relating to the government of the Company's native forces, which at the time of this Act coming into operation shall be in force and use in any part or parts of the said territories, shall remain in force.'

By s. 22 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), the Governor-General in Council was empowered at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations as aforesaid, and subject to the provisions therein contained, 'to make laws and regulations for repealing, amending, or altering any laws or regulations whatever now in force or hereafter to be in force in the Indian territories now under the dominion of Her Majesty, and to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, and for all courts of justice whatever, and for all places and things whatever within the said territories, and for all servants of the Government of India within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty; and the laws and regulations so to be made by the Governor-General in Council shall control and supersede all laws and regulations in anywise repugnant thereto which shall have been made prior thereto by the governors of the presidencies of Fort Saint George and Bombay respectively in Council, or the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor in Council of any presidency or other territory for which a council may be appointed, with power to make laws and regulations, under and by virtue of this Act: Provided always, that the said Governor-General in Council shall not have the power of making any laws or regulations which shall repeal or in any way affect any of the provisions of this Act:

'Or any of the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1833, and of the Government of India Act, 1853, and of the Government of India Act, 1854, which after the passing of this Act shall remain in force:

'Or any provisions of the Government of India Act, 1858, or of the Government of India Act, 1859:

'Or of any Act enabling the Secretary of State in Council to raise money in the United Kingdom for the Government of India:

'Or of the Acts for punishing mutiny and desertion in Her Majesty's Army or in Her Majesty's Indian forces respectively; but subject to the provision contained in the Government of India Act, 1833. s. 73, respecting the Indian articles of war:

A few Parliamentary enactments of constitutional importance were passed during the interval between the Charter Acts of 1793 and 1813. Legislation
between
1793 and
1813.

The lending of money by European adventurers to native princes on exorbitant terms had long produced grave scandals, such as those which were associated with the name of Paul Benham, and were exposed by Burke in his speech on the Nabob of Arcot's debts. An Act of 1797¹ laid down an important provision (s. 28) which is still in force, and which prohibits, under heavy penalties, unauthorized loans by British subjects to native princes.

The same Act reduced the number of judges of the supreme court at Calcutta to three, a chief justice and two puisnes, and authorized the grant of charters for the constitution of a recorder's court instead of the mayor's court at Madras and Bombay. It reserved native laws and customs in terms similar to those contained in the Act of 1781. It also embodied an important provision giving an additional and express sanction to the exercise of a local power of legislation in the Presidency of Bengal. One of Lord Cornwallis' regulations of 1793 (Reg. 41) had provided for forming into a regular code all regulations that might be enacted for the internal government of the British territories of Bengal. The Act of 1797 (s. 8) recognized and confirmed this 'wise and salutary provision,' and directed that all regulations which should be issued and framed by the Governor-General in Council at Fort William in Bengal, affecting the rights, persons, or property of the natives, or of any other individuals who might be amenable to the provincial courts of justice, should be registered in the judicial department, and formed into a regular code and printed, with translations in the country languages, and that all the grounds of each regulation should be prefixed to it. The provincial courts of judicature were directed to be bound by these regulations, and copies of the regulations of each year were

¹ 37 Geo. III, c. 142. See Digest, s. 118.

CHAPTER IV

APPLICATION OF ENGLISH LAW TO NATIVES OF INDIA

	PAGE
Introduction of English Law into India	323
Charter of 1753	324
Warren Hastings' ' Plan ' of 1772	<i>ib.</i>
Gradual modification of criminal law	325
Observance of native rules as to family law	<i>ib.</i>
The Lex Loci Act	327
Law applicable to persons neither Hindus nor Mahomedans	329
Rules as to local usage in Bombay and the Punjab	<i>ib.</i>
Native Christians and Armenians	330
Parsees	<i>ib.</i>
Justice, equity, and good conscience	<i>ib.</i>
State of law at passing of Charter Act of 1833	<i>ib.</i>
First Indian Law Commission	332
Penal Code, Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure, &c.	<i>ib.</i>
Indian Succession Act	<i>ib.</i>
Oudh Estates Act	333
Hindu Wills Act	<i>ib.</i>
Probate and Administration Act	334
Indian Contract Act	<i>ib.</i>
Negotiable Instruments Act	<i>ib.</i>
Transfer of Property Act	335
Trusts Act	<i>ib.</i>
Easements Act	336
Guardian and Wards Act	<i>ib.</i>
Law of torts	<i>ib.</i>
Subjects to which English and native law respectively apply	<i>ib.</i>
Attempt to govern natives by native law, Englishmen by English law	337
Causes of its failure	338
Reason for codification	339
Merits of Indian codes	<i>ib.</i>
How far codification applicable to native law	340
Codes and text-books	341

CHAPTER V

BRITISH JURISDICTION IN NATIVE STATES

Territorial character of Parliamentary legislation	342
Principles limiting extra-territorial legislation	<i>ib.</i>
Cases in which Parliament legislates for offences committed out of British territory	344
Offences at sea	345
Treason	347
Murder and manslaughter	<i>ib.</i>
Slave trade offences	<i>ib.</i>
Offences against Explosive Substances Act	<i>ib.</i>

SECTION	<i>Local Legislatures.</i>	PAGE
70.	Meaning of local legislatures	213
71.	Constitution of legislative council in Madras and Bombay	<i>ib.</i>
72.	Procedure at legislative meetings of councils of Madras and Bombay	214
73.	Constitution of legislative councils of lieutenant-governors	215
74.	Power to constitute new local legislatures	216
75.	Procedure at meetings of lieutenant-governor's council	218
76.	Powers of local legislature	<i>ib.</i>
77.	Business at legislative meetings	221
78.	Assent to Acts of local legislatures	222
	<i>Validity of Indian Laws.</i>	
79.	Removal of doubts as to validity of certain laws	223

PART VII.

SALARIES, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, VACATION OF OFFICE,
TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS, &c.

80.	Salaries and allowances of governor-general and certain other officials in India	224
81.	Leave of absence to members of council	226
82.	Provision as to absence from India or province	<i>ib.</i>
83.	Conditional appointments	229
84.	Power for governor-general to exercise powers before taking seat	<i>ib.</i>
85.	Provision for temporary vacancy in office of governor-general	230
86.	Provision for temporary vacancy in office of Governor of Madras or Bombay	231
87.	Provision for temporary vacancy in office of ordinary member of council	232
88.	Vacancies amongst additional members of council	233
89.	Leave on furlough	234
90.	Power to make regulations as to Indian appointments	<i>ib.</i>

PART VIII.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF INDIA.

91.	No disabilities in respect of religion, colour, or place of birth	234
92.	Regulations for admission to civil service	<i>ib.</i>
93.	Offices reserved to civil servants	235
94.	Power to appoint natives of India to reserved offices	<i>ib.</i>
95.	Power to make provisional appointments in certain cases	237

PART IX.

THE INDIAN HIGH COURTS.

	<i>Constitution.</i>	
96.	Constitution of high courts	237
97.	Tenure of office of judges of high courts	238
98.	Precedence of judges of high courts	<i>ib.</i>
99.	Salaries, &c., of judges of high courts	<i>ib.</i>
100.	Provision for vacancy in the office of chief justice or other judges	<i>ib.</i>

The first important amendments of Pitt's Act were made in 1786. In that year Lord Cornwallis¹ was appointed governor-general, and he made it a condition of his accepting office that his powers should be enlarged. Accordingly an Act was passed which empowered the governor-general in special cases to override the majority of his council and act on his own responsibility², and enabled the offices of governor-general and commander-in-chief to be united in the same person³.

By another Act of the same session the provision requiring the approbation of the king for the choice of governor-general was repealed. But as the Crown still retained the power of recall this repeal was not of much practical importance⁴.

A third Act⁵ repealed the provisions requiring servants of the Company to disclose the amount of property brought home by them, and amended the constitution and procedure of the special court under the Act of 1784. It also declared (s. 29) that the criminal jurisdiction of the supreme court at Calcutta was to extend to all criminal offences committed in any part of Asia, Africa, or America, beyond the Cape of Good Hope to the Straits of Magellan, within the limits of the Company's trade, and (s. 30) that the governor or president and council of Fort St. George, in their courts of oyer and terminer and gaol delivery, and the mayor's court at Madras should have civil and criminal jurisdiction over all British subjects residing in the territories of the Company on the coast of Coromandel, or in any other part of the Carnatic,

¹ 'The first of the new dynasty of Parliamentary Governors-General.' Lyall, *British Dominion in India*, p. 218.

² See Digest, s. 44.

³ 26 Geo. III, c. 16. Lord Cornwallis, though holding the double office of governor-general and commander-in-chief, still found his powers insufficient, and was obliged to obtain in 1791 a special Act (31 Geo. III, c. 40) confirming his orders and enlarging his powers. The exceptional powers given to the governor-general by the Act of 1786 were reproduced in the Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 47-51), by sections which are still nominally in force but have been practically superseded by a later enactment of 1870 (33 Vict. c. 3, s. 5). See Digest, s. 44.

⁴ 26 Geo. III, c. 25.

⁵ 26 Geo. III, c. 57.

Court of Directors. Departure from India with intent to return to Europe was declared to vacate the office of governor-general, commander-in-chief, and certain other high offices. The procedure in the councils of the three presidencies was regulated, the powers of control exercisable by the governor-general were emphasized and explained, and the power of the governor-general to overrule the majority of his council was repeated and extended to the Governors of Madras and Bombay. The governor-general, whilst visiting another presidency, was to supersede the governor, and might appoint a vice-president to act for him in his absence. A series of elaborate provisions continued the exclusive privileges of trade for a further term of twenty years, subject to modifications of detail. Another equally elaborate set of sections regulated the application of the Company's finances. Power was given to raise the dividend to 10 per cent., and provision was made for payment to the Exchequer of an annual sum of £500,000 out of the surplus revenue which might remain after meeting the necessary expenses, paying the interest on, and providing for reduction of capital of, the Company's debt, and payment of dividend. It is needless to say that this surplus was never realized. The mutual claims of the Company and the Crown in respect of military expenses were adjusted by wiping out all debts on either side up to the end of 1792, and providing that thenceforward the Company should defray the actual expenses incurred for the support and maintenance of the king's troops serving in India. Some supplementary provisions regulated matters of civil administration in India. The admiralty jurisdiction of the supreme court of Calcutta was expressly declared to extend to the high seas. Power was given to appoint covenanted servants of the Company or other British inhabitants to be justices of the peace in Bengal. Power was also given to appoint scavengers for the presidency towns, and to levy what would now be called a sanitary rate. And the sale of spirituous liquors was made subject to the grant of a licence.

PART VI.

INDIAN LEGISLATION.

Legislation by Governor-General in Council.

60.—(1) For the purposes of legislation, the governor-general nominates persons resident in India to be additional members of his council (a). Additional members of council for legislative purposes. [24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, ss. 9, 10, 11. 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 3. 55 & 56 Vict. c. 14, s. 1.]

(2) The number of the additional members of the governor-general's council is such as to the governor-general from time to time seems expedient, but must be not less than ten and not greater than sixteen (b).

(3) At least one-half of the additional members of the governor-general's council must be persons not in the civil or military service of the Crown in India, and if any such additional member accepts office under the Crown in India his seat as an additional member thereupon becomes vacant.

(4) The term of office of an additional member of the governor-general's council is two years.

(5) When and so long as the governor-general and his council are in a province administered by a lieutenant-governor or chief commissioner, that lieutenant-governor or chief commissioner is an additional member of the council, in excess, if necessary, of the maximum number hereinbefore specified of additional members.

(6) The additional members of the governor-general's council are entitled to be present at the legislative meetings of the council, and at no others.

(7) The Governor-General in Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, make regulations as to the conditions under which nominations may be made in accordance with this section, and prescribe the manner in which such regulations are to be carried into effect (c).

(a) The Legislative Council of the Government of India is an expansion of the Governor-General's executive council. Its cumbrous

Company were to continue their trade in accordance with the provisions of the charter of 1698, but were to change their name for that of 'The United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies.'

A deed of the same date, by which the 'dead stock' of the two Companies was conveyed to trustees, contains an interesting catalogue of their Indian possessions at that time.

Difficulties arose in carrying out the arrangement of 1702, and it became necessary to apply for the assistance of Parliament, which was given on the usual terms. By an Act of 1707¹ the English Company were required to advance to the Crown a further loan of £1,200,000 without interest, a transaction which was equivalent to reducing the rate of interest on the total loan of £3,200,000 from 8 to 5 per cent. In consideration of this advance the exclusive privileges of the Company were continued to 1726, and Lord Godolphin was empowered to settle the differences still remaining between the London Company and the English Company. Lord Godolphin's Award was given in 1708, and in 1709 Queen Anne accepted a surrender of the London Company's charters and thus terminated their separate existence. The original charter of the New or English Company thus came to be, in point of law, the root of all the powers and privileges of the United Company, subject to the changes made by statute. Henceforth down to 1833 (see 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. III) the Company bear their new name of 'The United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies.'

Period
between
1708 and
1765.

For constitutional purposes the half-century which followed the union of the two Companies may be passed over very lightly.

An Act of 1711² provided that the privileges of the United Company were not to be determined by the repayment of the loan of two millions.

The exclusive privileges of the United Company were

¹ 6 Anne, c. 71.

² 10 Anne, c. 35.

extended for further terms by Acts of 1730¹ and 1744². The price paid for the first extension was an advance to the State of £200,000 without interest, and the reduction of the rate of interest on the previous loan from 5 per cent. to 4 per cent. By another Act of 1730³ the security for the loan by the Company was transferred from the special taxes on which it had been previously charged to the 'aggregate fund,' the predecessor of the modern Consolidated Fund. The price of the second extension, which was to 1780, was a further loan of more than a million at 3 per cent. By an Act of 1750⁴ the interest on the previous loan of £3,200,000 was reduced, first to 3½ per cent., and then to 3 per cent.

Successive Acts were passed for increasing the stringency of the provisions against interlopers⁵ and for penalizing any attempt to support the rival Ostend Company⁶.

In 1726 a charter was granted establishing or reconstituting

¹ 3 Geo. II, c. 14.

² 17 Geo. II, c. 17.

³ 3 Geo. II, c. 20.

⁴ 23 Geo. II, c. 22.

⁵ 1718, 5 Geo. I, c. 21; 1720, 7 Geo. I, Stat. 1, c. 21; 1722, 9 Geo. I, c. 26; 1732, 5 Geo. II, c. 29. See the article on 'Interlopers' in the *Dictionary of Political Economy*. For the career of a typical interloper see the account of Thomas Pitt, afterwards Governor of Madras, and grandfather of the elder William Pitt, given in vol. iii. of Yule's edition of the *Diary of William Hedges*. The relations between interlopers and the East India Company in the preceding century are well illustrated by Skinner's case, which arose on a petition presented to Charles II soon after the Restoration. According to the statement signed by the counsel of Skinner there was a general liberty of trade to the East Indies in 1657 (under the Protectorate), and he in that year sent a trading ship there; but the Company's agents at Bantam, under pretence of a debt due to the Company, seized his ship and goods, assaulted him in his warehouse at Jamba in the island of Sumatra, and dispossessed him of the warehouse and of a little island called Barella. After various ineffectual attempts by the Crown to induce the Company to pay compensation, the case was, in 1665, referred by the king in council to the twelve judges, with the question whether Skinner could have full relief in any court of law. The answer was that the king's ordinary courts of justice could give relief in respect of the wrong to person and goods, but not in respect of the house and island. The House of Lords then resolved to relieve Skinner, but these proceedings gave rise to a serious conflict between the House of Lords and the House of Commons. See Hargrave's Preface to Hale's *Jurisdiction of the House of Lords*, p. cv.

⁶ Charter granted by the Emperor Charles VI in 1722, but withdrawn in 1725.

the wish, the honour, and policy of this nation,' the governor-general and his council were not, without the express authority of the Court of Directors, or of the secret committee, to declare war, or commence hostilities, or enter into any treaty for making war, against any of the country princes or States in India, or any treaty for guaranteeing the possession of any country prince or State, except where hostilities had actually been commenced, or preparations actually made for the commencement of hostilities, against the British nation in India, or against some of the princes of States who were dependent thereon, or whose territories were guaranteed by any existing treaty ¹.

The provisions of the Act of 1773 for the punishment of offences committed by British subjects in India were repeated and strengthened. Thus the receipt of presents by persons in the employment of the Company or the Crown was to be deemed extortion, and punishable as such, and there was an extraordinary provision requiring the servants of the Company, under heavy penalties, to declare truly on oath the amount of property they had brought from India.

All British subjects were declared to be amenable to all courts of competent jurisdiction in India or in England for acts done in Native States, as if the act had been done in British territory ². The Company were not to release or compound any sentence or judgement of a competent court against any of their servants, or to restore any such servant to office after he had been dismissed in pursuance of a judicial sentence. The governor-general was empowered to issue his warrant for taking into custody any person suspected of carrying on illicit correspondence with any native prince or other person having authority in India ³.

¹ s. 34. This enactment with its recital was substantially reproduced by a section of the Act of 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 42) which still remains unrepealed. See Digest, s. 48.

² s. 44. Re-enacted by 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 67. See Digest, s. 119.

³ s. 53. This section was re-enacted in substance by 33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 45, 46. See Digest, s. 120.

A special court, consisting of three judges, four peers, and six members of the House of Commons, was constituted for the trial in England of offences committed in India ¹.

The Company were required to take into consideration their civil and military establishments in India, and to give orders 'for every practicable retrenchment and reduction,' and numerous internal regulations, several of which had been proposed by Fox, were made for Indian administration. Thus, promotion was to be as a rule by seniority, writers and cadets were to be between the ages of fifteen and twenty-two when sent out, and servants of the Company who had been five years in England were not to be capable of appointment to an Indian post, unless they could show that their residence in England was due to ill health.

The double government established by Pitt's Act of 1784, with its cumbrous and dilatory procedure and its elaborate system of checks and counter-checks, though modified in details, remained substantially in force until 1858. In practice the power vested in the Board of Control was exercised by the senior commissioner, other than the Chancellor of the Exchequer or Secretary of State. He became known as the President of the Board of Control, and occupied a position in the Government of the day corresponding to some extent to that of the modern Secretary of State for India. But the Board of Directors, though placed in complete subordination to the Board of Control, retained their rights of patronage and their powers of revision, and were thus left no unsubstantial share in the home direction of Indian affairs ².

¹ ss. 66-80. The elaborate enactments constituting the court and regulating its procedure were amended by an Act of 1786 (26 Geo. III, c. 57), and still remain on the Statute Book, but appear never to have been put in force. 'In 149 B.C., on the proposal of Lucius Calpurnius Piso, a standing Senatorial Commission (*quaestio ordinaria*) was instituted to try in judicial form the complaints of the provincials regarding the extortions of their Roman magistrates.' Mommsen, 3, 73.

² As to the practical working of the system at the close of the eighteenth century see Kaye's *Administration of the East India Company*, p. 129.

Board of Control. They were to consist of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and one of the secretaries of state for the time being, and of four other Privy Councillors, appointed by the king, and holding office during pleasure. There was to be a quorum of three, and the president was to have a casting vote. They were unpaid, and had no patronage, but were empowered 'to superintend, direct, and control, all acts, operations, and concerns which in anywise relate to the civil or military government or revenues of the British territorial possessions in the East Indies.' They were to have access to all papers and instruments of the Company, and to be furnished with such extracts or copies as they might require. The directors were required to deliver to the Board of Control copies of all minutes, orders, and other proceedings of the Company, and of all dispatches sent or received by the directors or any of their committees, and to pay due obedience to, and be bound by, all orders and directions of the Board, touching the civil or military government and revenues of India. The Board might approve, disapprove, or modify the dispatches proposed to be sent by the directors, might require the directors to send out the dispatches as modified, and in case of neglect or delay, might require their own orders to be sent out without waiting for the concurrence of the directors.

A committee of secrecy, consisting of not more than three members, was to be formed out of the directors, and, when the Board of Control issued orders requiring secrecy, the committee of secrecy was to transmit these orders to India, without informing the other directors ¹.

The Court of Proprietors lost its chief governing faculty, for it was deprived of the power of revoking or modifying any proceeding of the Court of Directors which had received the approval of the Board of Control ².

¹ See Digest, s. 14.

² s. 29. The Court of Proprietors had recently overruled the resolution of the Court of Directors for the recall of Warren Hastings.

These provisions related to the Government of India at home. Modifications were also made in the governing bodies of the different presidencies in India.

The number of members of the governor-general's council was reduced to three, of whom the commander-in-chief of the Company's forces in India was to be one and to have precedence next to the governor-general.

The Government of each of the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay was to consist of a governor and three counsellors, of whom the commander-in-chief in the presidency was to be one, unless the commander-in-chief of the Company's forces in India happened to be in the presidency, in which case he was to take the place of the local commander-in-chief. The governor-general or governor was to have a casting vote.

The governor-general, governors, commander-in-chief, and members of council were to be appointed by the Court of Directors. They, and any other person holding office under the Company in India, might be removed from office either by the Crown or by the directors. Only covenanted servants of the Company were to be qualified to be members of council. Power was given to make provisional and temporary appointments. Resignation of the office of governor-general, governor, commander-in-chief, or member of council was not to be valid unless signified in writing¹.

The control of the governor-general and council over the government of the minor presidencies was enlarged, and was declared to extend to 'all such points as relate to any transactions with the country powers, or to war or peace, or to the application of the revenues or forces of such presidencies in time of war.'

A similar control over the military and political operations of the governor-general and council was reserved to the Court of Directors. 'Whereas to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India are measures repugnant to

¹ s. 28. See Digest, s. 82. This was probably enacted in consequence of the circumstances attending Hastings' resignation of office.

by the Act of 1773 to the governor-general and council ought to be more distinctly ascertained. But the Court of Proprietors of the Company persisted in retaining Hastings in office in defiance both of their directors and of the House of Commons, and no steps were taken for further legislation until after the famous coalition ministry of Fox and North had come into office. Soon after this event, Dundas, who was now in opposition, introduced a Bill which empowered the king to recall the principal servants of the Company, and invested the Governor-General of Bengal with power which was little short of absolute. But a measure introduced by a member of the opposition had no chance of passing, and the Government were compelled to take up the question themselves.

It was under these circumstances that Fox introduced his famous East India Bill of 1783. His measure would have completely altered the constitution of the East India Company. It was clear that the existing distribution of powers between the State, the Court of Directors, and the Court of Proprietors at home, and the Company's servants abroad, was wholly unsatisfactory, and led to anarchy and confusion. Dundas had proposed to alter it by making the governor-general practically independent, and vesting him with absolute power. Fox adopted the opposite course of increasing the control of the State over the Company at home and its officers abroad. His Bill proposed to substitute for the existing Courts of Directors and Proprietors a new body, consisting of seven commissioners, who were to be named in the Act, were during four years to be irremovable, except upon an address from either House of Parliament, and were to have an absolute power of placing or displacing all persons in the service of the Company, and of ordering and administering the territories, revenues, and commerce of India. Any vacancy in the body was to be filled by the king. A second or subordinate body, consisting of nine assistant directors chosen by the legislature from among the largest proprietors, was to be formed for the

Fox's East
India Bill.

purpose of managing the details of commerce. For the first five years they were given the same security of tenure as the seven commissioners, but vacancies in their body were to be filled by the Court of Proprietors.

The events which followed the introduction of Fox's East India Bill belong rather to English than to Indian constitutional history. Everybody is supposed to know how the Bill was denounced by Pitt and Thurlow as a monstrous device for vesting the whole government and patronage of India in Fox and his Whig satellites ; how, after having been carried through the House of Commons by triumphant majorities, it was defeated in the House of Lords through the direct intervention of the king ; how George III contumeliously drove Fox and North out of office after the defeat of their measure ; how Pitt, at the age of twenty-five, ventured to assume office with a small minority at his back, and how his courage, skill, and determination, and the blunders of his opponents, converted that minority into a majority at the general election of 1784.

Pitt's Act
of 1784.

Like other ministers, Pitt found himself compelled to introduce and defend when in office measures which he had denounced when in opposition. The chief ground of attack on Fox's Bill was its wholesale transfer of patronage from the Company to nominees of the Crown. Pitt steered clear of this rock of offence. He also avoided the appearance of radically altering the constitution of the Company. But his measure was based on the same substantial principle as that of his predecessor and rival, the principle of placing the Company in direct and permanent subordination to a body representing the British Government.

The Act of 1784¹ begins by establishing a board of six commissioners, who were formally styled the ' Commissioners for the Affairs of India ' but were popularly known as the

¹ 24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25. Almost the whole of this Act has been repealed, but many of its provisions were re-enacted in the subsequent Acts of 1793, 1813, and 1833.

were expressly empowered to make rules, ordinances, and regulations. But regulations made under this power had to be registered in the supreme court¹, with the consent and approbation of that court. In 1780 the governor-general and council made regulations, in addition to those of 1772, for the more effectual and regular administration of justice in the provincial civil courts, and in 1781 they issued a revised code superseding all former regulations. If these regulations were made under the power given by the Act of 1773 they ought to have been registered. But it does not appear that they were so registered, and after the passing of the Act of 1781 the governor-general and council preferred to act under the powers which enabled them to legislate without any reference to the supreme court. However, notwithstanding the limited purpose for which the powers of 1781 were given, it was under those powers that most of the regulation laws for Bengal purported to be framed. Regulations so made did not require registration or approval by the supreme court. But it was for some time doubtful whether they were binding on that court².

The Act of 1781 for defining the powers of the supreme court was not the only legislation of that year affecting the East India Company. The Company had by 1778 duly repaid their loan of £1,400,000 from the Exchequer, and they subsequently reduced the bond debt to the limits prescribed by an Act of that year³. By an Act passed in 1781⁴, the Company were required to pay a single sum of £400,000 to the public in discharge of all claims to a share in their

Further
legislation
of 1781.

¹ As French laws had to be registered by the *Parlement*, and as Acts of Parliament affecting the Channel Islands still have to be registered by the Royal Courts.

² See Cowell's *Tagore Law Lectures*, 1872, and *In the matter of Ameer Khan*, 6 Bengal Law Reports, 392, 408. The power of legislation was recognized and extended in 1797 by 37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 8. See below, p. 71.

³ 19 Geo. III, c. 61.

⁴ 21 Geo. III, c. 65. The Company were unable to meet the payments required by this Act, and successive Acts had to be passed for extending the terms fixed for payment (22 Geo. III, c. 51; 23 Geo. III, cc. 36, 83; 24 Geo. III, sess. 1, c. 3).

CONTENTS

vi

SECTION,	<i>The Council of the Governor-General.</i>	PAGE
38. Constitution of governor-general's council		178
39. Ordinary members of council		178
40. Extraordinary members of council		179
41. Ordinary and legislative meetings of governor-general's council		180
42. Ordinary meetings of council		181
43. Business of Governor-General in Council		181
44. Procedure in case of difference of opinion		182
45. Provision for appointment of president of council		183
46. Provision for absence of governor-general, or president, from meetings of council		184
47. Powers of governor-general in absence from council		185

War and Treaties.

48.	Restriction on power of Governor-General in Council to make war or treaty	186
-----	---	-----

PART V.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

General.

49.	Relation of local Governments to Governor-General in Council	187
-----	--	-----

Governments of Madras and Bombay

50.	Governments of Madras and Bombay	188
51.	Ordinary members of councils	189
52.	Ordinary and legislative meetings of Madras and Bombay Councils	190
53.	Procedure in cases of difference of opinion	191
54.	Business of Governor in Council	192

Lieutenant-Governorships and other Provinces

55.	Lieutenant-governors	193
56.	Power to place territory under authority of Governor-General in Council	194
57.	Power to alter limits of provinces	194
58.	Saving as to laws	195
59.	Power to extend boundaries of presidency towns	196

PART VI.

INDIAN LEGISLATION.

Legislation by Governor-General in Council.

60.	Additional members of council for legislative purposes	197
61.	Times and places of legislative meetings	198
62.	Constitution of legislative meetings of council	199
63.	Legislative power of Governor-General in Council	200
64.	Business at legislative meetings	201
65.	Assent of governor-general to Acts	202
66.	Power of Crown to disallow Acts	203
67.	Rules for conduct of business	204
68.	Power to make regulations	205
69.	Power to make ordinances in emergency	206

This famous resolution, which was doubtless inspired, if not penned, by Sir Josiah Child, announces in unmistakable terms the determination of the Company to guard their commercial supremacy on the basis of their territorial sovereignty and foreshadows the annexations of the next century.

Con-
troversies
after
Revolution of
1688.

The Revolution of 1688 dealt a severe blow to the policy of Sir Josiah Child, and gave proportionate encouragement to his rivals. They organized themselves in an association which was popularly known as the New Company, and commenced an active war against the Old Company both in the City and in Parliament. The contending parties presented petitions to the Parliament of 1691, and the House of Commons passed two resolutions, first, that the trade of the East Indies was beneficial to the nation, and secondly, that the trade with the East Indies would be best carried on by a joint-stock company possessed of extensive privileges. The practical question, therefore, was, not whether the trade to the East Indies should be abolished, or should be thrown open, but whether the monopoly of the trade should be left in the hands of Sir Josiah Child and his handful of supporters. On this question the majority of the Commons wished to effect a compromise—to retain the Old Company, but to remodel it and to incorporate it with the New Company. Resolutions were accordingly carried for increasing the capital of the Old Company, and for limiting the amount of the stock which might be held by a single proprietor. A Bill based on these resolutions was introduced and read a second time, but was dropped in consequence of the refusal of Child to accept the terms offered to him. Thereupon the House of Commons requested the king to give the Old Company the three years' warning in pursuance of which their privileges might be determined.

Two years of controversy followed. The situation of the Old Company was critical. By inadvertently omitting to pay a tax which had been recently imposed on joint-stock companies, they had forfeited their charter and might at

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1821 (May). Death of Napoleon Buonaparte. Congress of Verona.	
1822 (March 27). Canning appointed Governor-General of India but made Foreign Secretary instead (September).	1823-8. Lord Amherst, Governor-General.
1825. Commercial panic in England.	1824. War with Burma. Rangoon taken.
1827 (April 24). Canning, Prime Minister; dies August 8. (September 5.) Lord Goderich, Prime Minister. (October 20.) Battle of Navarino.	1826. Storming of Bhurtpur. Annexation of Assam.
1828 (January 25). Duke of Wellington, Prime Minister.	1828-35. Lord William Bentinck, Governor-General.
1830 (June 26). William IV. (November 22.) Lord Grey, Prime Minister.	1830. Mysore becomes a protected State.
1832 (June). Reform Bill passed.	1833. Charter Act (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85) terminates trading functions of East India Company and defines legislative powers of Governor-General in Council. Macaulay appointed legislative member of Governor-General's Council.
1834 (July 17). Lord Melbourne, Prime Minister; dismissed November 15. (December 26.) Sir Robert Peel, Prime Minister.	1834. Annexation of Coorg.
1835 (April 8). Sir Robert Peel resigns. (April 18.) Lord Melbourne, Prime Minister.	1835. Lord Heytesbury appointed Governor-General by Sir R. Peel but appointment cancelled by Whigs.
	1836-42. Lord Auckland, Governor-General.
	1836. Lieutenant-Governorship of North-Western Provinces constituted.
1837. Queen Victoria.	1838. First Afghan War.
1839-42. War between England and China.	1839. Capture of Ghazni and Kandahar.
	Death of Ranjit Singh.
	1840. Surrender of Dost Mohammad.

In order that regard should be had to the civil and religious usages of the said natives, the rights and authorities of fathers of families, and masters of families, according as the same might have been exercised by the Gentu or Mahomedan law, were to be preserved to them within their families, nor was any act done in consequence of the rule and law of caste, respecting the members of the said families only, to be held and adjudged a crime, although it might not be held justifiable by the laws of England.

Rules and forms for the execution of process in the supreme court were to be accommodated to the religion and manners of the natives, and sent to the Secretary of State, for approval by the king.

The appellate jurisdiction of the governor-general and council in country cases was recognized and confirmed in cautiously general terms. 'Whereas the governor-general and council, or some committee thereof or appointed thereby, do determine on appeals and references from the country or provincial courts in civil cases,' 'the said court shall and lawfully may hold all such pleas and appeals, in the manner and with such powers as it hitherto hath held the same, and shall be deemed in law a court of record; and the judgements therein given shall be final and conclusive, except upon appeal to His Majesty, in civil suits only, the value of which shall be five thousand pounds and upwards.' The same court was further declared to be a court to hear and determine on all offences, abuses, and extortions committed in the collection of revenue, and on severities used beyond what shall appear to the said court customary or necessary to the case, and to punish the same according to sound discretion, provided the said punishment does not extend to death, or maiming, or perpetual imprisonment¹.

No action for wrong or injury was to lie in the supreme

¹ See Harington's *Analysis*, i. 22. But it seems very doubtful whether the council or any of the council had in fact ever exercised jurisdiction as a court of Sadr Diwani Adalat. See *Nuncomar and Impey*, ii. 189.

court against any person whatsoever exercising any judicial office in the country courts for any judgement, decree, or order of the court, nor against any person for any act done by or in virtue of the order of the court.

The defendants in the Patna case were to be released from prison on the governor-general and council giving security (which they were required to do) for the damages recovered in the action against them; and were to be at liberty to appeal to the king in council against the judgement, although the time for appealing under the charter had expired.

The decision of Parliament, as expressed in the Act of 1781, was substantially in favour of the council and against the court on all points. Sir James Stephen argues that the enactment of this Act 'shows clearly that the supreme court correctly interpreted the law as it stood¹.' But this contention seems to go too far. A legislative reversal of a judicial decision shows that, in the opinion of the legislature, the decision is not substantially just, but must not necessarily be construed as an admission that the decision is technically correct. It is often more convenient to cut a knot by legislation than to attempt its solution by the dilatory and expensive way of appeal.

The Act of 1781 contained a further provision which was of great importance in the history of Indian legislation. It empowered the governor-general and council 'from time to time to frame regulations for the provincial courts and councils.' Copies of these regulations were to be sent to the Court of Directors and to the Secretary of State. They might be disallowed or amended by the king in council, but were to remain in force unless disallowed within two years.

On assuming the active duties of revenue authority in Bengal in 1772, the president and council had made general regulations for the administration of justice in the country by the establishment of civil and criminal courts. And by the Regulating Act of 1773 the governor-general and council

¹ *Nuncomar and Impey*, ii. 192.

famous Patna case, in which the supreme court gave judgement with heavy damages to a native plaintiff in an action against officers of the Patna provincial council, acting in its judicial capacity. Impey's judgement in this case was made one of the grounds of impeachment against him, but is forcibly defended by Sir James Stephen against the criticisms of Mill and others, as being not only technically sound, but substantially just. Hastings endeavoured to remove the friction between the supreme court and the country courts by appointing Impey judge of the court of Sadr Diwani Adalat, and thus vesting in him the appellate and revisional control over the country courts which had been nominally vested in, but never exercised by, the supreme court. Had he succeeded, he would have anticipated the arrangements under which, some eighty years later, the court of Sadr Diwani Adalat and the supreme court were fused into the high court. But Impey compromised himself by drawing a large salary from his new office in addition to that which he drew as chief justice, and his acceptance of a post tenable at the pleasure of the Company was held to be incompatible with the independent position which he was intended to occupy as chief justice of the supreme court.

In the year 1781 a Parliamentary inquiry was held into the administration of justice in Bengal, and an amending Act of that year ^{Amending Act of 1781.} ¹ settled some of the questions arising out of the Act of 1773.

The governor-general and council of Bengal were not to be subject, jointly or severally, to the jurisdiction of the supreme court for anything counselled, ordered, or done by them in their public capacity. But this exemption did not apply to orders affecting British subjects ².

The supreme court was not to have or exercise any jurisdiction in matters concerning the revenue, or concerning any act done in the collection thereof, according to the usage and practice of the country, or the regulations of the governor-general and council ³.

¹ 21 Geo. III, c. 70.

² See Digest, s. 106.

³ Ibid. s. 101.

No person was to be subject to the jurisdiction of the supreme court by reason only of his being a 'landowner, landholder, or farmer of land or of land rent, or for receiving a payment or pension in lieu of any title to, or ancient possession of, land or land rent, or for receiving any compensation or share of profits for collecting of rents payable to the public out of such lands or districts as are actually farmed by himself, or those who are his under-tenants in virtue of his farm, or for exercising within the said lands and farms any ordinary or local authority commonly annexed to the possession or farm thereof or by reason of his becoming security for the payment of rent.'

No person was, by reason of his being employed by the Company, or by the governor-general and council, or by a native or descendant of a native of Great Britain, to become subject to the jurisdiction of the supreme court, in any matter of inheritance or succession to lands or goods, or in any matter of dealing or contract between parties, except in actions for wrongs or trespasses, or in civil suits by agreement of the parties.

Registers were to be kept showing the names, &c., of natives employed by the Company.

The supreme court was, however, to have jurisdiction in all manner of actions and suits against all and singular the inhabitants of Calcutta 'provided that their inheritance and succession to lands, rents, and goods, and all matters of contract and dealing between party and party, shall be determined in the case of Mahomedans, by the laws and usages of Mahomedans, and in the case of Gentus by the laws and usages of Gentus; and where only one of the parties shall be a Mahomedan or Gentu by the laws and usages of the defendant ¹.'

¹ This proviso was taken from Warren Hastings' plan for the administration of justice prepared and adopted in 1772, when the Company first 'stood forth as diwan.' It is interesting as a recognition of the personal law which played so important a part during the break-up of the Roman empire, but has, in the West, been gradually superseded by territorial law. As to the effect of this and similar enactments, see Digest, s. 108 and note thereon.

to new and foreign circumstances. For want of such experience England was destined to lose her colonies in the Western hemisphere. For want of it mistakes were committed which imperilled the empire she was building up in the East. The Regulating Act provided insufficient guidance as to points on which both the Company and the supreme court were likely to go astray; and the charter by which it was supplemented did not go far to supply its deficiencies. The language of both instruments was vague and inaccurate. They left unsettled questions of the gravest importance. The Company was vested with supreme administrative and military authority. The Court was vested with supreme judicial authority. Which of the two authorities was to be paramount? The court was avowedly established for the purpose of controlling the actions of the Company's servants, and preventing the exercise of oppression against the natives of the country. How far could it extend its controlling power without sapping the foundations of civil authority? The members of the supreme council were personally exempt from the coercive jurisdiction of the court. But how far could the court question and determine the legality of their orders?

Both the omissions from the Act and its express provisions were such as to afford room for unfortunate arguments and differences of opinion.

What law was the supreme court to administer? The Act was silent. Apparently it was the unregenerate English law, insular, technical, formless, tempered in its application to English circumstances by the quibbles of judges and the obstinacy of juries, capable of being an instrument of the most monstrous injustice when administered in an atmosphere different from that in which it had grown up.

To whom was this law to be administered? To British subjects and to persons in the employment of the Company. But whom did the first class include? Probably only the class now known as European British subjects, and probably not the native 'inhabitants of India' residing in the three

provinces, except such of them as were resident in the town of Calcutta. But the point was by no means clear¹.

What constituted employment by the Company? Was a native landowner farming revenues so employed? And in doubtful cases on whom lay the burden of proving exemption from or subjection to the jurisdiction?

These were a few of the questions raised by the Act and charter, and they inevitably led to serious conflicts between the council and the court.

In the controversies which followed there were, as Sir James Stephen observes², three main heads of difference between the supreme council and the supreme court.

These were, first, the claims of the court to exercise jurisdiction over the whole native population, to the extent of making them plead to the jurisdiction if a writ was served on them. The quarrel on this point culminated in what was known as the Cossijurah case, in which the sheriff and his officers, when attempting to execute a writ against a zemindar, were driven off by a company of sepoys acting under the orders of the council. The action of the council was not disapproved by the authorities in England, and thus this contest ended practically in the victory of the council and the defeat of the court.

The second question was as to the jurisdiction of the court over the English and native officers of the Company employed in the collection of revenues for corrupt or oppressive acts done by them in their official capacity. This jurisdiction the Company were compelled by the express provisions of the Regulating Act to admit, though its exercise caused them much dissatisfaction.

The third question was as to the right of the supreme court to try actions against the judicial officers of the Company for acts done in the execution of what they believed, or said they believed, to be their legal duty. This question arose in the

¹ See *In the matter of Ameer Khan*, 6 Bengal Law Reports, 615, 441.

² *Nuncomar and Impey*, ii. 237.

(November, 1776) and Hastings was able, by means of his casting vote, to maintain his supremacy in the council. He withdrew his authority to his English agent, and obtained from the judges of the supreme court an opinion that his resignation was invalid. These proceedings possibly occasioned the provision which was contained in the Charter Act of 1793, was repeated in the Act of 1833, and is still law, that the resignation of a governor-general is not valid unless signified by a formal deed¹.

The provisions of the Act of 1773 are obscure and defective as to the nature and extent of the authority exercisable by the governor-general and his council, as to the jurisdiction of the supreme court, and as to the relation between the Bengal Government and the court. The ambiguities of the Act arose partly from the necessities of the case, partly from a deliberate avoidance of new and difficult questions on constitutional law. The situation created in Bengal by the grant of the Diwani in 1765, and recognized by the legislation of 1773, resembled what in the language of modern international law is called a protectorate. The country had not been definitely annexed²; the authority of the Delhi emperor and of his native vicegerent was still formally recognized; and the attributes of sovereignty had been divided between them and the Company in such proportions that whilst the substance had passed to the latter, a shadow only remained with the former. But it was a shadow with which potent conjuring tricks could be performed. Whenever the Company found it convenient, they could play off the authority derived from the Mogul against the authority derived from the British law, and justify under the one proceedings which

Difficulties
between
supreme
council
and
supreme
court.

¹ See 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, s. 79. Digest, s. 82.

² On **May** 10, 1773, the House of Commons, on the motion of General Burgoyne, passed two resolutions, (1) that all acquisitions made by military force or by treaty with foreign powers do of right belong to the State; (2) that to appropriate such acquisitions to private use is illegal. But the nature and extent of the sovereignty exercised by the Company was for a long time doubtful. See *Mayor of Lyons v. East India Company*, 3 State Trials, new series, 647, 707; 1 Moore P. C. 170.

it would have been difficult to justify under the other. In the one capacity the Company were the all-powerful agents of an irresponsible despot; in the other they were tied and bound by the provisions of charters and Acts of Parliament. It was natural that the Company's servants should prefer to act in the former capacity. It was also natural that their Oriental principles of government should be regarded with dislike and suspicion by English statesmen, and should be found unintelligible and unworkable by English lawyers steeped in the traditions of Westminster Hall.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century we became familiar with situations of this kind, and we have devised appropriate formulæ for dealing with them. The modern practice has been to issue an Order in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, establishing consular and other courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and providing them with codes of procedure and of substantive law, which are sometimes derived from Anglo-Indian sources. The jurisdiction is to be exercised and the law is to be applied in cases affecting British subjects, and, so far as is consistent with international law and comity, in cases affecting European or American foreigners. But the natives of the country are, so far as is compatible with regard to principles of humanity, left in enjoyment of their own laws and customs. If a company has been established for carrying on trade or business, its charter is so framed as to reserve the supremacy and prerogatives of the Crown. In this way a rough-and-ready system of government is provided, which would often fail to stand the application of severe legal tests, but which supplies an effectual mode of maintaining some degree of order in uncivilized or semi-civilized countries¹.

But in 1773 both the theory and the experience were lacking, which are requisite for adapting English institutions

¹ See the Orders in Council under the successive Foreign Jurisdiction Acts, printed in the Statutory Rules and Orders Revised, and the charters granted to the Imperial British East Africa Company (Hertslet, *Map of Africa by Treaty*, i. 118), to the Royal British South Africa Company (*ibid.* i. 274), and to the Royal Niger Company (*ibid.* i. 146).

If any governor-general, governor, member of council, judge of the supreme court, or any other person for the time being employed in the service of the Company, committed any offence against the Act, or was guilty of any crime, misdemeanour, or offence against any of His Majesty's subjects, or any of the inhabitants of India, he might be tried and punished by the Court of King's Bench in England.

Charter
of 1774
constituting
supreme
court at
Calcutta.

The charter of justice authorized by the Regulating Act was dated March 26, 1774, and remained the foundation of the jurisdiction exercised by the supreme court at Calcutta until the establishment of the present high court under the Act of 1861¹. The first chief justice was Sir Elijah Impey. His three colleagues were Chambers, Lemaistre, and Hyde.

Diffi-
culties
arising out
of Regu-
lating Act.

Warren Hastings retained the office of governor-general until 1785, when he was succeeded temporarily by Sir John Macpherson, and, eventually, by Lord Cornwallis. His appointment, which was originally for a term of five years, was continued by successive Acts of Parliament. His administration was distracted by conflicts between himself and his colleagues on the supreme council, and between the supreme council and the supreme court, conflicts traceable to the defective provisions of the Regulating Act.

Diffi-
culties
in the
council.

Of Hastings' four colleagues, one, Barwell, was an experienced servant of the Company, and was in India at the time of his appointment. The other three, Clavering, Monson, and Francis, were sent out from England, and arrived in Calcutta with the judges of the new supreme court.

Barwell usually supported Hastings. Francis, Clavering, and Monson usually opposed him. Whilst they acted together, Hastings was in a minority, and found his policy thwarted and his decisions overruled. In 1776 he was reduced to such depression that he gave his agents in England a conditional authority to tender his resignation. The Court of Directors accepted his resignation on this authority, and took steps to supply his place. But in the meantime Clavering died

¹ Copy printed in Morley's *Digest*, ii. 549.

SECTION	PAGE
8. President and vice-president of council	149
9. Meetings of the council	<i>ib.</i>
10. Procedure at meetings	<i>ib.</i>
11. Committees of council	150
<i>Orders and Dispatches.</i>	
12. Submission of orders, &c., to council, and record of opinions thereon	150
13. Provision for cases of urgency	151
14. Provision as to secret orders and dispatches	<i>ib.</i>
15. Signature and address of orders, &c.	152
16. Communication to Parliament as to orders for commencing hos- tilities	<i>ib.</i>
17. Correspondence by governor-general with Secretary of State	<i>ib.</i>
<i>Establishment of Secretary of State.</i>	
18. Establishment of the Secretary of State	153
19. Pensions	<i>ib.</i>
<i>Indian Appointments.</i>	
20. Indian appointments	154
21. Powers of Crown and Secretary of State as to removal of officers	155
PART II.	
REVENUES OF INDIA.	
22. Application of revenues	159
23. Control of Secretary of State over expenditure of revenues	160
24. Restriction on application of revenues to military operations be- yond the frontier	161
25. Accounts of Secretary of State with Bank	<i>ib.</i>
26. Powers of attorney for sale or purchase of stock and receipt of dividends	162
27. Provision as to securities	163
28. Exercise of borrowing powers	<i>ib.</i>
29. Accounts to be annually laid before Parliament	164
30. Audit of Indian accounts in United Kingdom	164
PART III.	
PROPERTY, CONTRACTS, AND LIABILITIES.	
31. Power of Secretary of State to sell, mortgage, and buy property	167
32. Contracts of Secretary of State	<i>ib.</i>
33. Power to execute assurances, &c., in India	168
34. Power to dispose of escheated property, &c.	169
35. Rights and liabilities of Secretary of State in Council	170
PART IV.	
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL IN COUNCIL.	
<i>General Powers of Governor-General in Council.</i>	
36. General powers and duties of Governor-General in Council	176
<i>The Governor-General.</i>	
37. The governor-general	177

any time find themselves deprived of their privileges without any notice at all. At length, by means of profuse bribes, Child obtained an order requiring the Attorney-General to draw up a charter regranting to the Old Company its former privileges, but only on the condition that the Company should submit to further regulations substantially in accordance with those sanctioned by the House of Commons in 1691. However, even these terms were considered insufficient by the opponents of the Company, who now raised the constitutional question whether the Crown could grant a monopoly of trade without the authority of Parliament¹. This question, having been argued before the Privy Council, was finally decided in favour of the Company, and an order was passed that the charter should be sealed.

Accordingly the charter of October 7, 1693, confirms the former charter of the Company, but is expressed to be revocable in the event of the Company failing to submit to such further regulations as might be imposed on them within a year. These regulations were embodied in two supplemental charters dated November 11, 1693, and September 28, 1694. By the first of these charters the capital of the Company was increased by the addition of £744,000. No person was to subscribe more than £10,000. Each subscriber was to have one vote for each £1,000 stock held by him, up to £10,000 but no more. The governor and deputy governor were to be qualified by holding £4,000 stock, and each committee by holding £1,000 stock. The dividends were to be made in money alone. Books were to be kept for recording transfers of stock, and were to be open to public inspection. The joint stock was to continue for twenty-one years and no longer.

The charter of 1694 provided that the governor and deputy governor were not to continue in office for more than two

¹ The question had been previously raised in the great case of *The East India Company v. Sandys* (1683-85), in which the Company brought an action against Mr. Sandys for trading to the East Indies without a licence, and the Lord Chief Justice (Jeffreys) gave judgement for the plaintiffs. See the report in 10 State Trials, 371.

be set aside by the king in council. A copy of them was to be kept affixed conspicuously in the India House, and copies were also to be sent to a secretary of state.

The remaining provisions of the Act were aimed at the most flagrant of the abuses to which public attention had been recently directed. The governor-general and members of his council, and the chief justice and judges of the supreme court, were prohibited from receiving presents or being concerned in any transactions by way of traffic, except the trade and commerce of the Company.

No person holding or exercising any civil or military office under the Crown or the Company in the East Indies was to receive directly or indirectly any present or reward from any of the Indian princes or powers, or their ministers or agents, or any of the nations of Asia. Any offender against this provision was to forfeit double the amount received, and might be removed to England. There was an exception for the professional remuneration of counsellors at law, physicians, surgeons, and chaplains.

No collector, supervisor, or any other of His Majesty's subjects employed or concerned in the collection of revenues or administration of justice in the provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa was, directly or indirectly, to be concerned in the buying or selling of goods by way of trade, or to intermeddle with or be concerned in the inland trade in salt, betelnut, tobacco or rice, except on the Company's account. No subject of His Majesty in the East Indies was to lend money at a higher rate of interest than 12 per cent. per annum. Servants of the Company prosecuted for breach of public trust, or for embezzlement of public money or stores, or for defrauding the Company, might, on conviction before the supreme court at Calcutta or any other court of judicature in India, be fined and imprisoned, and sent to England. If a servant of the Company was dismissed for misbehaviour, he was not to be restored without the assent of three-fourths

be set aside by the king in council. A copy of them was to be kept affixed conspicuously in the India House, and copies were also to be sent to a secretary of state.

The remaining provisions of the Act were aimed at the most flagrant of the abuses to which public attention had been recently directed. The governor-general and members of his council, and the chief justice and judges of the supreme court, were prohibited from receiving presents or being concerned in any transactions by way of traffic, except the trade and commerce of the Company.

No person holding or exercising any civil or military office under the Crown or the Company in the East Indies was to receive directly or indirectly any present or reward from any of the Indian princes or powers, or their ministers or agents, or any of the nations of Asia. Any offender against this provision was to forfeit double the amount received, and might be removed to England. There was an exception for the professional remuneration of counsellors at law, physicians, surgeons, and chaplains.

No collector, supervisor, or any other of His Majesty's subjects employed or concerned in the collection of revenues or administration of justice in the provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa was, directly or indirectly, to be concerned in the buying or selling of goods by way of trade, or to intermeddle with or be concerned in the inland trade in salt, betelnut, tobacco or rice, except on the Company's account. No subject of His Majesty in the East Indies was to lend money at a higher rate of interest than 12 per cent. per annum. Servants of the Company prosecuted for breach of public trust, or for embezzlement of public money or stores, or for defrauding the Company, might, on conviction before the supreme court at Calcutta or any other court of judicature in India, be fined and imprisoned, and sent to England. If a servant of the Company was dismissed for misbehaviour, he was not to be restored without the assent of three-fourths both of the directors and of the proprietors.

guarantee) either declare war or commence hostilities or enter into any treaty for making war against any prince or State in India, or enter into any treaty for guaranteeing the possessions of any such prince or State.

(2) In any such excepted case the Governor-General in Council may not declare war or commence hostilities or enter into a treaty for making war against any other prince or State than such as is actually committing hostilities or making preparations as aforesaid, and shall not make a treaty for guaranteeing the possessions of any prince or State except on the consideration of that prince or State actually engaging to assist His Majesty against such hostilities commenced or preparations made as aforesaid.

(3) When the Governor-General in Council commences any hostilities or makes any treaty, he must forthwith communicate the same, with the reasons therefor, to the Secretary of State.

(a) This section first appeared in Pitt's Act of 1784 (24 Geo. III, sess. 2, c. 25, s. 34), and was preceded by the preamble:— 'Whereas to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India are measures repugnant to the wish, the honour, and policy of this nation.' (See above, p. 64.) It was re-enacted, with the preamble, by s. 42 of the Act of 1793, and, as so re-enacted, is still on the statute book. It is of historical interest as an expression of the views with which the expansion of the territorial possessions of the East India Company was regarded in the eighteenth century, but as it relates only to hostilities against and treaties with the 'country princes or States in India,' it is no longer of practical importance. The last provision, though expressed in general terms, obviously refers to the hostilities and treaties referred to in the preceding part.

PART V.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

General.

49.—(1) Every local Government (a) must obey the orders of Relation the Governor-General in Council, and keep him constantly of local Governments to his superintendence and authority in all matters relating to Governor-General the administration of its province. in

planatory notes. This digest has been framed on the principles now usually adopted in the preparation of consolidation Bills to be submitted to Parliament; that is to say, it arranges in convenient order, and states in language appropriate to the present day, what is conceived to be the net effect of enactments scattered through several Acts. When this process is applied to a large number of enactments belonging to different dates, it is always found that there are *lacunae* to be filled, obscurities to be removed, inconsistencies to be harmonized, doubts to be resolved. The Legislature can cut knots of this kind by declaring authoritatively how the law is to be construed. The draftsman or the text-writer has no such power. He can merely state, to the best of his ability, the conclusions at which he has arrived, and supply materials for testing their accuracy.

The fourth chapter, which deals with the application of English law to the natives of India, is based on a paper read at a meeting of the Society of Comparative Legislation. It points to a field in which useful work may be done by students of comparative jurisprudence.

In the fifth chapter I have tried to explain and illustrate the legal relations between the Government of British India and the Governments of the Native States by comparison with the extra-territorial powers exercised by British authorities in other parts of the world, such as the countries where there is consular jurisdiction, and in particular the modern protectorates. The subject is interesting and important, but full of difficulty. The rules and usages which govern the relation between States and peoples of different degrees and kinds of civilization are in a state of constant flux and rapid growth, and on many topics dealt with in this chapter it would be unsafe to lay down general propositions without qualifying and guarding words. There are quicksands at every step.

Since the date of the first edition of this work important changes have been made in the Orders in Council which regulate the exercise of jurisdiction in African protectorates, and the jurisdiction exercised by the Governor-General in Council in the Native States of India has been brought into line with the extra-territorial jurisdiction exercised under authority of the

Judicial
charters
of 1726
and 1753.

municipalities at Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta, and setting up or remodelling mayor's and other courts at each of these places. At each place the mayor and aldermen were to constitute a mayor's court with civil jurisdiction, subject to an appeal to the governor or president in council, and a further appeal in more important cases to the king in council. The mayor's court now also gave probates and exercised testamentary jurisdiction. The governor or president and the five seniors of the council were to be justices of the peace, and were to hold quarter sessions four times in the year, with jurisdiction over all offences except high treason. At the same time the Company were authorized, as in previous charters, to appoint generals and other military officers, with power to exercise the inhabitants in arms, to repel force by force, and to exercise martial law in time of war.

The capture of Madras by the French in 1746 having destroyed the continuity of the municipal corporation at that place, the charter of 1726 was surrendered and a fresh charter was granted in 1753.

The charter of 1753 expressly excepted from the jurisdiction of the mayor's court all suits and actions between the Indian natives only, and directed that these suits and actions should be determined among themselves, unless both parties submitted them to the determination of the mayor's courts. But, according to Mr. Morley, it does not appear that the native inhabitants of Bombay were ever actually exempted from the jurisdiction of the mayor's court, or that any peculiar laws were administered to them in that court¹.

The charters of 1726 and 1753 have an important bearing on the question as to the precise date at which the English criminal law was introduced at the presidency towns. This question is discussed by Sir James Stephen with reference to the legality of Nuncomar's conviction for forgery; the point being whether the English statute of 1728 (2 Geo. II, c. 25) was or was not in force in Calcutta at the time of

¹ Morley's *Digest*, Introduction, p. clxix.

Nuncomar
that En
extent
of 1726,
lative au
cessive c
If so, the
in 1770
committe
judicial a
According
Calcutta
and Briti
did not ap
cation ext
Code the

In 1744
in 1746
led to th
The first
George Cl
'when a
the exam
ment durin
years prev
time a sma
as could b
smuggled
Company.
a commissi
India.' Du
mainly, for

¹ Morley's
² *Indian P*
of the rise and
force had been

to take a chaplain in every ship of 500 tons. 'The ministers were to learn the Portuguese language and to 'apply themselves to learn the native language of the country where they shall reside, the better to enable them to instruct the Gentoos that shall be the servants or slaves of the same Company or of their agents, in the Protestant religion.' Schoolmasters were also to be provided.

It soon appeared that the Old Company had, to use a modern phrase, 'captured' the New Company. They had subscribed £315,000 towards the capital of two millions authorized by the Act of 1698. They had thus acquired a material interest in their rivals' concern, and, at the same time, they were in possession of the field. They had the capital and plant indispensable for the East India trade, and they retained concurrent privileges of trading. They soon showed their strength by obtaining a private Act of Parliament (11 & 12 Will. III, c. 4) which continued them as a trading corporation until repayment of the whole loan of two millions.

The situation was impossible; the privileges nominally obtained by the New Company were of no real value to them; and a coalition between the two Companies was the only practicable solution of the difficulties which had been created by the Act and charters of 1698.

The coalition was effected in 1702, through the intervention of Lord Godolphin, and by means of an Indenture Tripartite to which Queen Anne and the two Companies were parties, and which embodied a scheme for equalizing the capital of the two Companies and for combining their stocks. The Old Company were to maintain their separate existence for seven years, but the trade of the two Companies was to be carried on jointly, in the name of the English Company, but for the common benefit of both, under the direction of twenty-four managers, twelve to be selected by each Company. At the end of the seven years the Old Company were to surrender their charters. The New or English

establish such rules of procedure and do such other things as might be found necessary for the administration of justice and the execution of the powers given by the charter. The court was declared to be at all times a court of record and a court of oyer and terminer and jail delivery in and for the town of Calcutta and factory of Fort William and the factories subordinate thereto. Its jurisdiction was declared to extend to all British subjects who should reside in the kingdoms or provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, or any of them, under the protection of the United Company. And it was to have 'full power and authority to hear and determine all complaints against any of His Majesty's subjects for crimes, misdemeanours, or oppressions, and also to entertain, hear, and determine any suits or actions whatsoever against any of His Majesty's subjects in Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, and any suit, action, or complaint against any person employed by or in the service of the Company or of any of His Majesty's subjects.'

But on this jurisdiction two important limitations were imposed.

First, the court was not to be competent to hear or determine any indictment or information against the governor-general or any of his council for any offence, not being treason or felony¹, alleged to have been committed in Bengal, Behar, or Orissa. And the governor-general and members of his council were not to be liable to be arrested or imprisoned in any action, suit, or proceeding in the supreme court².

Then, with respect to proceedings in which natives of the country were concerned, it was provided that the court should hear and determine 'any suits or actions whatsoever of any of His Majesty's subjects against any inhabitant of India residing in any of the said kingdoms or provinces of Bengal, Behar, or Orissa,' on any contract in writing where

¹ Could it then try the governor-general for treason or felony?

² The saving appears to be limited to civil proceedings. It would exempt against arrest on mesne process.

the cause of action exceeded 500 rupees, and where the said inhabitant had agreed in the contract that, in case of dispute, the matter should be heard and determined in the supreme court. Such suits or actions might be brought in the first instance before the supreme court, or by appeal from any of the courts established in the provinces.

This authority, though conferred in positive, not negative, terms, appears to exclude by implication civil jurisdiction in suits by British subjects against 'inhabitants' of the country, except by consent of the defendant, and is silent as to jurisdiction in civil suits by 'inhabitants' against British subjects, or against other 'inhabitants.'

An appeal against the supreme court was to lie to the king in council, subject to conditions to be fixed by the charter.

All offences of which the supreme court had cognizance were to be tried by a jury of British subjects resident in Calcutta.

The governor-general and council and the chief justice and other judges of the supreme court were to act as justices of the peace, and for that purpose to hold quarter sessions.

Liberal salaries were provided out of the Company's revenues for the governor-general and his council and the judges of the supreme court. The governor-general was to have annually £25,000, each member of his council £10,000, the chief justice £8,000, and each puisne judge £6,000.

The governor-general and council were to have powers 'to make and issue such rules, ordinances, and regulations for the good order and civil government' of the Company's settlement at Fort William, and the subordinate factories and places, as should be deemed just and reasonable, and should not be repugnant to the laws of the realm, and to set, impose, inflict, and levy reasonable fines and forfeitures for their breach.

But these rules and regulations were not to be valid until duly registered and published in the supreme court, with the assent and approbation of the court, and they might, in effect,

The first governor-general and counsellors were named in the Act. They were to hold office for five years¹, and were not to be removable in the meantime, except by the king on the representation of the Court of Directors. A casual vacancy in the office of governor-general during these five years was to be supplied by the senior member of council. A casual vacancy in the office of member of council was during the same time to be filled by the Court of Directors with the consent of the Crown. At the end of the five years the patronage was to be vested in the Company. The governor-general and council were to be bound by the votes of a majority of those present at their meetings, and in the case of an equal division the governor-general was to have a casting vote.

Warren Hastings, who had been appointed Governor of Bengal in 1772, was to be the first governor-general. The first members of his council were to be General Clavering, Colonel Monson, Mr. Barwell, and Mr. Francis.

The supremacy of the Bengal Presidency over the other presidencies was definitely declared. The governor-general and council were to have power of superintending and controlling the government and management of the presidencies of Madras, Bombay, and Bencoolen², so far and in so much as that it should not be lawful for any Government of the minor presidencies to make any orders for commencing hostilities, or declaring or making war, against any Indian princes or powers, or for negotiating or concluding any treaty with any such prince or power without the previous consent

¹ It has been suggested that this enactment is the origin of the custom under which the tenure of the more important offices in India, such as those of governor-general, governor, lieutenant-governor, and member of council, is now limited to five years. The limitation is not imposed by statute or by the instrument of appointment.

² Bencoolen, otherwise Fort Marlborough, is in Sumatra. It was founded by the English in 1686, and was given to the Dutch by the London Treaty, March 11, 1824, in exchange for establishments on the continent of India and for the town and fort of Malacca and its dependencies, which were handed over to the East India Company by 5 Geo. IV, c. 108.

of the governor-general and council, except in such cases of imminent necessity as would render it dangerous to postpone such hostilities or treaties until the arrival of their orders, and except also in cases where special orders had been received from the Company¹. A president and a council offending against these provisions might be suspended by order of the governor-general and council. The governors of the minor presidencies were to obey the order of the governor-general and council, and constantly and dutifully to transmit to them advice and intelligence of all transactions and matters relating to the government, revenues, or interest of the Company.

Provisions followed for regulating the relations of the governor-general and his council to the Court of Directors, and of the directors to the Crown. The governor-general and council were to obey the orders of the Court of Directors and keep them constantly informed of all matters relating to the interest of the Company. The directors were, within fourteen days after receiving letters or advices from the governor-general and council, to transmit to the Treasury copies of all parts relating to the management of the Company's revenue, and to transmit to a secretary of state copies of all parts relating to the civil or military affairs and government of the Company.

Important changes were made in the arrangements for the administration of justice in Bengal. The Crown was empowered to establish by charter a supreme court of judicature at Fort William, consisting of a chief justice and three other judges, who were to be barristers of five years' standing, and were to be appointed by the Crown. The supreme court was empowered to exercise civil, criminal, admiralty, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to appoint such clerks and other ministerial officers with such reasonable salaries as should be approved by the governor-general and council, and to

¹ This was the first assertion of Parliamentary control over the treaty relations of the Company.

years, that eight new committees were to be chosen each year, and that a general court must be called within eight days on request by six members holding £1,000 stock each. The three charters were to be revocable after three years' warning, if not found profitable to the realm.

By a charter of 1698 the provisions as to voting powers and qualification were modified. The qualification for a single vote was reduced to £500, and no single member could give more than five votes. The qualification for being a committee was raised to £2,000.

The affair
of the
Redbridge
and its
results.

In the meantime, however, the validity of the monopoly renewed by the charter of 1693 had been successfully assailed. Immediately after obtaining a renewal of their charter the directors used their powers to effect the detention of a ship called the *Redbridge*, which was lying in the Thames and was believed to be bound for countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope. The legality of the detention was questioned, and the matter was brought up in Parliament. And on January 11, 1694, the House of Commons passed a resolution 'that all subjects of England have equal rights to trade to the East Indies unless prohibited by Act of Parliament.'

'It has ever since been held,' says Macaulay, 'to be the sound doctrine that no power but that of the whole legislature can give to any person or to any society an exclusive privilege of trading to any part of the world.' It is true that the trade to the East Indies, though theoretically thrown open by this resolution, remained practically closed. The Company's agents in the East Indies were instructed to pay no regard to the resolutions of the House of Commons, and to show no mercy to interlopers. But the constitutional point was finally settled. The question whether the trading privileges of the East India Company should be continued was removed from the council chamber to Parliament, and the period of control by Act of Parliament over the affairs of the Company began.

The first Act of Parliament for regulating the trade to

the E
had c
Comp
and th
cellor
for a
State.
Comp
compa
adhere
their v
compa
the m
ultima
feature
guage
the St
propos
be eith
vidual
which
of the
might
the am
ment.
though
unite t
trading
original
vided t
become
This
ters. 7
to bor
stampe
the sub

and endeavoured to provide more legitimate remunerations for the higher classes of the Company's civil and military servants by assigning to them specific shares in the profits derived from the salt monopoly. According to his estimates the profits from this source of a commissioner or colonel would be at least £7,000 a year; those of a factor or major, £2,000¹.

At the presidency towns, civil justice was administered in the mayor's courts and courts of request, criminal justice by the justices in petty and quarter sessions. In 1772 Warren Hastings became Governor of Bengal, and took steps for organizing the administration of justice in the interior of that province. In the previous year the Court of Directors had resolved to assert in a more active form the powers given them by the grant of the Diwani in 1765, and in a letter of instructions to the president and council at Fort William had announced their resolution to 'stand forth as diwan,' and by the agency of the Company's servants to take upon themselves the entire care and management of the revenues². In pursuance of these instructions the Court of Directors appointed a committee, consisting of the Governor of Bengal and four members of council, and these drew up a report, comprising a plan for the more effective collection of the revenue and the administration of justice. This plan was adopted by the Government on August 21, 1772, and many of its rules were long preserved in the Bengal Code of Regulations³.

In pursuance of this plan, a board of revenue was created, consisting of the president and members of the council, and the treasury was removed from Moorsshedabad to Calcutta. The supervisors of revenue became collectors, and with them

¹ See Lecky, iv. 266, 270.

² Letter of August 28, 1771.

³ The office of 'diwan' implied, not merely the collection of the revenue, but the administration of civil justice. The 'nizamut' comprised the right of arming and commanding the troops, and the management of the whole of the police of the country, as well as the administration of criminal justice. Morley, *Digest*, p. xxxi. See a fuller account of Warren Hastings' Plan, *ibid.* p. xxxiv.

were associated native officers, styled diwans. Courts were established in each collectorship, one styled the Diwani, a civil court, and the other the Faujdari, a criminal court. Over the former the collector presided in his quality of king's diwan. In the criminal court the kazi and mufti of the district sat to expound the Mahomedan law. Superior courts were established at the chief seat of government, called the Sadr Diwani Adalat and the Sadr Nizamat Adalat. These courts theoretically derived their jurisdiction and authority, not from the British Crown, but from the native Government in whose name the Company acted as administrators of revenue. They were Company's courts, not king's courts.

Provisions
of Regu-
lating Act.

By the Regulating Act of 1773 the qualification to vote in the Court of Proprietors was raised from £500 to £1,000, and restricted to those who had held their stock for twelve months. The directors, instead of being annually elected, were to sit for four years, a quarter of the number being annually renewed.

For the government of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal, a governor-general and four counsellors were appointed, and the Act declared that the whole civil and military government of this presidency, and also the ordinary management and government of all the territorial acquisitions and revenues in the kingdoms of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, should, during such time as the territorial acquisitions and revenues remained in the possession of the Company, be vested in the governor-general and council of the Presidency of Fort William, in like manner as they were or at any time theretofore might have been exercised by the president and council or select committee in the said kingdoms. The avoidance of any attempt to define, otherwise than by reference to existing facts, the nature or extent of the authority claimed or exercised by the Crown over the Company in the new territorial acquisitions is very noticeable, and is characteristic of English legislation.

of the situation to introduce extensive alterations into the system of governing the Company's Indian possessions¹.

In spite of vehement opposition, two Acts were passed through Parliament by enormous majorities. By one of these Acts² the ministers met the financial embarrassments of the Company by a loan of £1,400,000 at 4 per cent., and agreed to forgo the Company's debt of £400,000 till this loan had been discharged. The Company were restricted from declaring any dividend above 6 per cent. till the new loan had been discharged, and above 7 per cent. until the bond debt was reduced to £1,500,000. They were obliged to submit their accounts every half-year to the Treasury, they were restricted from accepting bills drawn by their servants in India for above £300,000 a year, and they were required to export to the British settlements within their limits British goods of a specified value.

The other Act was that commonly known as the Regulating Act³. To understand the object and effect of its provisions brief reference must be made to the constitution of the Company at the time when it was passed.

The Regulating Act of 1773.

At home the Company were still governed in accordance with the charter of 1698, subject to a few modifications of detail made by the legislation of 1767. There was a Court of Directors and a General Court of Proprietors. Every holder

¹ The history of the East India Company tends to show that whenever a chartered company undertakes territorial sovereignty on an extensive scale the Government is soon compelled to accept financial responsibility for its proceedings, and to exercise direct control over its actions. The career of the East India Company as a territorial power may be treated as having begun in 1765, when it acquired the financial administration of the provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa. Within seven years it was applying to Parliament for financial assistance. In 1773 its Indian operations were placed directly under the control of a governor-general appointed by the Crown, and in 1784 the Court of Directors in England were made directly subordinate to the Board of Control, that is, to a minister of the Crown.

² 13 Geo. III, c. 64.

³ 13 Geo. III, c. 63. This Act is described in its 'short title' as an Act of 1772 because Acts then dated from the beginning of the session in which they were passed.

of £500 stock had a vote in the Court of Proprietors, but the possession of £2,000 stock was the qualification for a director. The directors were twenty-four in number, and the whole of them were re-elected every year.

In India each of the three presidencies was under a president or governor and council, appointed by commission of the Company, and consisting of its superior servants. The numbers of the council varied¹, and some of its members were often absent from the presidency town, being chiefs of subordinate factories in the interior of the country. All power was lodged in the president and council jointly, and nothing could be transacted except by a majority of votes. So unworkable had the council become as an instrument of government, that in Bengal Clive had been compelled to delegate its functions to a select committee.

The presidencies were independent of each other. The Government of each was absolute within its own limits, and responsible only to the Company in England.

The civil and military servants of the Company were classified, beginning from the lowest rank, as writers, factors, senior factors, and merchants. Promotion was usually by seniority. Their salaries were extremely small², but they made enormous profits by trading on their own account, and by money drawn from extortions and bribes. The select committee of 1773 published an account of such sums as had been proved and acknowledged to have been distributed by the princes and other natives of Bengal from the year 1757 to 1766, both included. They amounted to £5,940,987, exclusive of the grant made to Clive after the battle of Plassey. Clive, during his second governorship, made great efforts to put down the abuses of private trade, bribery, and extortion,

¹ They were usually from twelve to sixteen.

² In the early part of the eighteenth century a writer, after five years' residence in India, received £10 a year, and the salaries of the higher ranks were on the same scale. Thus a member of council had £80 a year. When Thomas Pitt was appointed Governor of Madras in 1698 he received £300 a year for salary and allowances, and £100 for outfit.

had been compelled to consent. The Company were required to pay into the Exchequer an annual sum of £400,000 for two years from February 1, 1767, and in consideration of this payment were allowed to retain their territorial acquisitions and revenues for the same period¹. At the same time certain duties on tea were reduced on an undertaking by the Company to indemnify the Exchequer against any loss arising from the reduction. Thus the State claimed its share of the Indian spoil, and asserted its rights to control the sovereignty of Indian territories.

In 1768 the restraint on the dividend was continued for another year², and in 1769 a new agreement was made by Parliament with the East India Company for five years, during which time the Company were guaranteed the territorial revenues, but were bound to pay an annuity of £400,000, and to export a specified quantity of British goods. They were at liberty to increase their dividends during that time to 12½ per cent, provided the increase did not exceed 1 per cent. If, however, the dividend should fall below 10 per cent, the sum to be paid to the Government was to be proportionately reduced. If the finances of the Company enabled them to pay off some specified debts, they were to lend some money to the public at 2 per cent.³

These arrangements were obviously based on the assumption that the Company were making enormous profits, out of which they could afford to pay, not only liberal dividends to their proprietors, but a heavy tribute to the State. The assumption was entirely false. Whilst the servants of the Company were amassing colossal fortunes, the Company itself was advancing by rapid strides to bankruptcy. Its debts were already estimated at more than six millions sterling. It supported an army of about 30,000 men. It paid about

¹ This was apparently the first direct recognition by Parliament of the territorial acquisitions of the Company. See *Danodhar Gordhan v. Deorun Kanji* (the *Bhaunagar* case), L. R. 1 App. Cas. 332, 342.

² 8 Geo. III, c. 1.

³ 9 Geo. III, c. 24.

one million sterling a year in the form of tributes, pensions, and compensations to the emperor, the Nabob of Bengal, and other great native personages. Its incessant wars, though they had hitherto been always successful, were always expensive, and a large portion of the wealth which should have passed into the general exchequer, was still diverted to the private accounts of its servants¹. Two great calamities hastened the crisis. In the south of India, Hyder Ali harried the Carnatic, defeated the English forces, and dictated peace on his own terms in 1769. In the north, the great famine of 1770 swept away more than a third of the inhabitants of Bengal.

Pecuniary
embarrassments
in 1772.

Yet the directors went on declaring dividends at the rates of 12 and 12½ per cent. At last the crash came. In the spring session of 1772 the Company had endeavoured to initiate legislation for the regulation of their affairs. But their Bill was thrown out on the second reading, and in its place a select committee of inquiry was appointed by the House of Commons. In June, 1772, Parliament was prorogued, and in July the directors were obliged to confess that the sum required for the necessary payments of the next three months was deficient to the extent of £1,293,000. In August the chairman and deputy chairman waited on Lord North to inform him that nothing short of a loan of a million from the public could save the Company from ruin.

In November, 1772, Parliament met again, and its first step was to appoint a new committee with instructions to hold a secret inquiry into the Company's affairs. This committee presented its first report with unexpected rapidity, and on its recommendation Parliament in December, 1772, passed an Act prohibiting the directors from sending out to India a commission of supervision on the ground that the Company would be unable to bear the expense².

Legislation of
1773.

In 1773 the Company came to Parliament for pecuniary assistance, and Lord North's Government took advantage

¹ Lecky, iv. 273.

² 13 Geo. III, c. 9.

Nuncomar's trial. Sir James Stephen inclines to the opinion that English criminal law was originally introduced to some extent by the charter of 1661, but that the later charters of 1726, 1753, and 1774 must be regarded as acts of legislative authority whereby it was reintroduced on three successive occasions, as it stood at the three dates mentioned. If so, the statute of 1728 would have been in force in Calcutta in 1770 when Nuncomar's offence was alleged to have been committed, and at the time of his trial in 1775. But high judicial authorities in India have maintained a different view. According to their view British statute law was first given to Calcutta by the charter establishing the mayor's court in 1726, and British statutes passed after the date of that charter did not apply to India, unless expressly or by necessary implication extended to it¹. Since the passing of the Indian Penal Code the question has ceased to be of practical importance.

In 1744 war broke out between England and France, and in 1746 their hostilities extended to India. These events led to the establishment of the Company's Indian Army. The first establishment of that army may, according to Sir George Chesney², be considered to date from the year 1748, 'when a small body of sepoys was raised at Madras, after the example set by the French, for the defence of that settlement during the course of the war which had broken out, four years previously, between France and England. At the same time a small European force was raised, formed of such sailors as could be spared from the ships on the coast, and of men smuggled on board the Company's vessels in England by the Company. An officer, Major Lawrence, was appointed by a commission from the Company to command these forces in India.' During the Company's earliest wars its army consisted mainly, for fighting purposes, of Europeans.

Mutiny
Act and
Articles of
War for
Indian
Forces.

¹ Morley's *Digest*, Introduction, pp. xi, xxiii.

² *Indian Polity* (3rd ed.), ch. xii, which contains an interesting sketch of the rise and development of the Indian Army. The nucleus of a European force had been formed at Bombay in 1668, *supra*, p. 18.

England. The eyes of the proprietors of the Company were dazzled by golden visions. On the dispatch bearing the grant of the Diwani being read to the Court of Proprietors they began to clamour for an increase of dividend, and, in spite of the Company's debts and the opposition of the directors, they insisted on raising the dividend in 1766 from 6 to 10 per cent., and in 1767 to 12½ per cent.

At the same time the public mind was startled by the enormous fortunes which 'Nabobs' were bringing home, and the public conscience was disturbed by rumours of the unscrupulous modes in which these fortunes had been amassed. Constitutional questions were also raised as to the right of a trading company to acquire on its own account powers of territorial sovereignty¹. The intervention of Parliament was imperatively demanded.

Legisla-
tion of
1767.

On November 25, 1766, the House of Commons resolved to appoint a committee of the whole house to inquire into the state and condition of the East India Company, and the proceedings of this committee led to the passage in 1767 of five Acts with reference to Indian affairs. The first disqualified a member of any company for voting at a general court unless he had held his qualification for six months, and prohibited the making of dividends except at a half-yearly or quarterly court². Although applying in terms to all companies, the Act was immediately directed at the East India Company, and its object was to check the trafficking in votes and other scandals which had recently disgraced their proceedings. The second Act³ prohibited the East India Company from making any dividend except in pursuance of a resolution passed at a general court after due notice, and directly overruled the recent resolution of the Company by forbidding them to declare any dividend in excess of 10 per cent. per annum until the next session of Parliament. The third and fourth Acts⁴ embodied the terms of a bargain to which the Company

¹ For the arguments on this question, see Lecky, ch. xii.

² 7 Geo. III, c. 48.

³ 7 Geo. III, c. 49.

⁴ 7 Geo. III, cc. 50, 57.

sustain or have just and well-grounded cause to fear any injury, loss, or damage, or upon any people who should interrupt, wrong, or injure them in their trade within the limits of the charters, or should in a hostile manner invade or attempt to weaken or destroy the settlements of the Company or to injure the king's subjects or others trading or residing within the Company's settlements or in any manner under the king's protection within the limits of the Company. The booty must also have been taken in wars or hostilities or expeditions begun, carried on, and completed by the forces raised and paid by the Company alone or by the ships employed at their sole expense. And there was a saving for the royal prerogative to distribute the booty in such manner as the Crown should think fit in all cases where any of the king's forces should be appointed and commanded to act in conjunction with the ships or forces of the Company. There was also an exception for goods taken from the king's subjects, which were to be restored on payment of reasonable salvage. These provisions, though they gave rise to difficult questions at various subsequent times, have now become obsolete. But the charter contained a further power which is still of practical importance. It expressly granted to the Company power, by any treaty of peace made between the Company, or any of their officers, servants, or agents, and any of the Indian princes or Governments, to cede, restore, or dispose of any fortresses, districts, or territories acquired by conquest from any of the Indian princes or Governments during the late troubles between the Company and the Nabob of Bengal, or which should be acquired by conquest in time coming, subject to a proviso that the Company should not have power to cede, restore, or dispose of any territory acquired from the subjects of any European power without the special licence and approbation of the Crown. This power has been relied on as the foundation, or one of the foundations, of the power of the Government of India to cede territory.

¹ *Lachmi Narayan v. Raja Pratab Singh*, I. L. R. 2 All. 1.

The year 1765 marks a turning-point in Anglo-Indian history, and may be treated as commencing the period of territorial sovereignty by the East India Company. The successes of Clive and Lawrence in the struggle between the English and French and their respective allies had extinguished French influence in the south of India. The victories of Plassey¹ and Baxar¹, made the Company masters of the north-eastern provinces of the peninsula. In 1760 Clive returned from Bengal to England. In 1765, after five years of confusion, he went back to Calcutta as Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Bengal, armed with extraordinary powers. His administration of eighteen months was one of the most memorable in Indian history. The beginning of our Indian rule dates from the second governorship of Clive, as our military supremacy had dated from his victory at Plassey. Clive's main object was to obtain the substance, though not the name, of territorial power, under the fiction of a grant from the Mogul Emperor.

This object was obtained by the grant from Shah Alam of the Diwani or fiscal administration of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa².

The criminal jurisdiction in the provinces was still left with the puppet Nawab, who was maintained at Moorshedabad, whilst the Company were to receive the revenues and to maintain the army. But the actual collection of the revenues still remained until 1772 in the hands of native officials.

Thus a system of dual government was established, under which the Company, whilst assuming complete control over the revenues of the country, and full power of maintaining or disbanding its military forces, left in other hands the responsibility for maintaining law and order through the agency of courts of law.

The great events of 1765 produced immediate results in

¹ Plassey (Clive), June 23, 1757; Baxar (Munro), October 23, 1764.

² The grant is dated August 17, 1765. The 'Orissa' of the grant corresponds to what is now the district of Midnapur, and is not to be confused with the modern Orissa, which was not acquired until 1803.

The Company as territorial sovereign. ✓

Grant of the Diwani. ✓

the East Indies was passed in 1698. The New Company had continued their attacks on the monopoly of the Old Company, a monopoly which had now been declared illegal, and they found a powerful champion in Montagu, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Old Company offered, in return for a monopoly secured by law, a loan of £700,000 to the State. But Montagu wanted more money than the Old Company could advance. He also wanted to set up a new company constituted in accordance with the views of his adherents. Unfortunately these adherents were divided in their views. Most of them were in favour of a joint-stock company. But some preferred a regulated company after the model of the Levant Company. The plan which Montagu ultimately devised was extremely intricate, but its general features cannot be more clearly described than in the language of Macaulay: 'He wanted two millions to extricate the State from its financial embarrassments. That sum he proposed to raise by a loan at 8 per cent. The lenders might be either individuals or corporations, but they were all, individuals and corporations, to be united in a new corporation, which was to be called the General Society. Every member of the General Society, whether individual or corporation, might trade separately with India to an extent not exceeding the amount which that member had advanced to the Government. But all the members or any of them might, if they so thought fit, give up the privilege of trading separately, and unite themselves under a royal Charter for the purpose of trading in common. Thus the General Society was, by its original constitution, a regulated company; but it was provided that either the whole Society or any part of it might become a joint-stock company.'

This arrangement was embodied in an Act and two charters. The Act (9 & 10 Will. III, c. 44) authorized the Crown to borrow two millions on the security of taxes on salt, and stamped vellum, parchment, and paper, and to incorporate the subscribers to the loan by the cumbrous name of the

Incorporation of English Company

It has been seen that by successive charters the Company had been authorized to raise troops and appoint officers. But the more extensive scale on which the military operations of the Company were now conducted made necessary further legislation for the maintenance of military discipline. An Act of 1754¹ laid down for the Indian forces of the Company provisions corresponding to those embodied in the annual English Mutiny acts. It imposed penalties for mutiny, desertion, and similar offences, when committed by officers or soldiers in the Company's service. The Court of Directors might, in pursuance of an authority from the king, empower their president and council and their commanders-in-chief to hold courts-martial for the trial and punishment of military offences. The king was also empowered to make articles of war for the better government of the Company's forces. The same Act contained a provision, repeated in subsequent Acts, which made oppression and other offences committed by the Company's presidents or councils cognizable and punishable in England. The Act of 1754 was amended by another Act passed in 1760².

Charters
of 1757
and 1758
as to
booty and
cession of
territory.

The warlike operations which were carried on by the East India Company in Bengal at the beginning of the second half of the eighteenth century, and which culminated in Clive's victory at Plassey, led to the grant of two further charters to the Company.

A charter of 1757 recited that the Nabob of Bengal had taken from the Company, without just or lawful pretence and contrary to good faith and amity, the town and settlement of Calcutta, and goods and valuable commodities belonging to the Company and to many persons trading or residing within the limits of the settlement, and that the officers and agents of the Company at Fort St. George had concerted a plan of operations with Vice-Admiral Watson and others, the commanders of our fleet employed in those parts, for regaining the town and settlement and the goods and com-

¹ 27 Geo. II, c. 9.

² 1 Geo. III, c. 14.

modities, and obtaining adequate satisfaction for their losses ; and that it had been agreed between the officers of the Company, on the one part, and the vice-admiral and commanders of the fleet, on the other part, assembled in a council of war, that one moiety of all plunder and booty ' which shall be taken from the Moors ' should be set apart for the use of the captors, and that the other moiety should be deposited till the pleasure of the Crown should be known. The charter went on to grant this reserved moiety to the Company, except any part thereof which might have been taken from any of the king's subjects. Any part so taken was to be returned to the owners on payment of salvage.

A charter of 1758, after reciting that powers of making peace and war and maintaining military forces had been granted to the Company by previous charters, and that many troubles had of late years arisen in the East Indies, and the Company had been obliged at very great expense to carry out a war in those parts against the French and likewise against the Nabob of Bengal and other princes or Governments in India, and that some of their possessions had been taken from them and since retaken, and forces had been maintained, raised, and paid by the Company in conjunction with some of the royal ships of war and forces, and that other territories or districts, goods, merchandises, and effects had been acquired and taken from some of the princes or Governments in India at variance with the Company by the ships and forces of the Company alone, went on to grant to the Company all such booty or plunder, ships, vessels, goods, merchandises, treasure, and other things as had since the charter of 1757 been taken or seized, *or should thereafter be taken*, from any of the enemies of the Company or any of the king's enemies in the East Indies by any ships or forces of the Company employed by them or on their behalf within their limits of trade. But this was only to apply to booty taken during hostilities begun and carried on in order to right and recompense the Company upon the goods, estate, or people of those parts from whom they should

stitution of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, whereon may depend in any degree the allegiance of any person to the Crown of the United Kingdom (*l*), or the sovereignty or dominion of the Crown over any part of British India (*m*).

(3) The Governor-General in Council has not power, without the previous approval of the Secretary of State in Council, to make any law empowering any court, other than a high court within the meaning of this Digest (*n*), to sentence to the punishment of death any of His Majesty's natural-born subjects born in Europe, or the children of such subjects, or abolishing any high court within the meaning of this Digest (*o*).

(4) Any law made in accordance with this section controls and supersedes any other law or regulation repugnant thereto which may have been previously made by any authority in India (*p*).

(5) A law made in accordance with this section for His Majesty's Indian Marine Service does not apply to any offence unless the vessel to which the offender belongs is at the time of the commission of the offence within the limits of Indian waters, that is to say, the high seas between the Cape of Good Hope on the West and the Straits of Magellan on the East (*q*), and any territorial waters between those limits.

(6) The punishments imposed by any such law as last aforesaid for offences must be similar in character to, and not in excess of, the punishments which may at the time of making the law be imposed for similar offences under the Acts relating to His Majesty's Navy, except that in the case of persons other than Europeans or Americans imprisonment for any term not exceeding fourteen years or transportation for life or any less term may be substituted for penal servitude.

(a) The legislative powers of the Governor-General in Council are derived from a series of enactments.

Under s. 73 of the Government of India Act, 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85), 'it is lawful for the said Governor-General in Council from time to time to make articles of war for the government of the native

mine whether a particular territory is British or not, it may be necessary to look not merely to the powers exercised within it, but also to the manner in which, and the understandings on which, those powers have been acquired and are being exercised. Where the acquisition dates from long back, difficult questions may arise. But in the case of recent acquisitions there will usually be no serious difficulty in determining whether what has been acquired is merely a right to exercise certain sovereign powers within a particular tract, or whether there has been such a transfer of sovereignty over the tract as to convert it into British territory.

Conclusions as to extra-territorial powers of Governor-General.

The general conclusions appear to be :—

1. The extra-territorial powers of the Governor-General of India are much wider than the extra-territorial powers of the Indian Legislature, and are not derived from, though they may be regulated or restricted by, English or Indian Acts.
2. Those powers are exercisable within the territories of all the Native States of India. Whether they are exercisable within the territories of any State outside India is a question which depends on the arrangements in force with the Government of that State, and on the extent to which the powers of the Crown exercisable in pursuance of such arrangements have been delegated to the Governor-General.
3. The jurisdiction exercisable under those powers might be made to extend not only to British subjects and to subjects of the State within which the jurisdiction is exercised, but also to foreigners.
4. The classes of persons and cases to which jurisdiction actually applies depend on the agreement, if any, in force with respect to its exercise, and, in the absence of express agreement, on usage and the circumstances of the case, and may be defined, restricted, or extended accordingly by the instrument regulating the exercise of the jurisdiction.

qualification for membership of the governor-general's council is somewhat different (s. 39).

(d) This proviso, which is taken from the Act of 1793, is practically inoperative.

Ordinary
and legis-
lative
meetings
of Madras
and
Bombay
Councils.

52.—(1) The councils of the governors of Madras and Bombay hold ordinary meetings, that is to say, meetings for executive purposes; and legislative meetings, that is to say, meetings for the purpose of making laws.

(2) The ordinary members of those councils are entitled to be present at all meetings thereof (a).

(a) This section does not reproduce any specific enactment, but represents the existing law.

Procedure
in cases of
difference
of opinion.
[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
ss. 47, 48,
49.]

53. The foregoing provisions of this Digest with respect to the procedure in case of a difference of opinion between the governor-general and his council, and in case of the governor-general being obliged to absent himself from his council by indisposition or other cause, apply, with the necessary modifications, in the case of a difference of opinion between the Governor of Madras or Bombay and his council, and in the case of either of those governors being obliged to absent himself from his council (a).

(a) See ss. 44 and 46. Section 44 reproduces 33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 47-49, as modified by 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3, s. 5. The last enactment applies only to the governor-general's council, but, as will be seen from the note to s. 44, does not substantially modify the Act of Geo. III.

Business
of Govern-
or in
Council.
[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
s. 39.
53 Geo.
III, c. 155,
s. 79.
24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 28.]

54.—(1) All orders and other proceedings of the Governor of Madras in Council and of the Governor of Bombay in Council must be expressed to be made by the Governor in Council, and must be signed by a secretary to the Government of the province, or otherwise as the Governor in Council may direct (a).

(2) The governors of Madras and Bombay respectively may make rules and orders for the conduct of business in their respective councils, other than the business at legislative meetings, and every order made or act done in accordance with such rules and orders is deemed to be the order or the act of the Governor in Council.

(a) See note on s. 43.

Lieutenant-Governorships and other Provinces.

55.—(1) The provinces known as Bengal (a), the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh (b), the Punjab (c), Burma (c) and Eastern Bengal and Assam (a) are administered by lieutenant-governors.

Lieutenant-governors.
[5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52, s. 2.
16 & 17 Vict. c. 95, s. 16.
17 & 18 Vict. c. 77, s. 4.
21 & 22 Vict. c. 106, s. 29.]

(2) Every lieutenant-governor of a province in India is appointed by the governor-general, subject to the approval of His Majesty (d).

(3) A lieutenant-governor must have been, at the time of his appointment, at least ten years in the service of the Crown in India (e).

(4) The Governor-General in Council may, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, declare and limit the extent of the authority of any lieutenant-governor (f).

(a) By s. 16 of the Government of India Act, 1853, the Court of Directors were authorized to declare that the Governor-General of India should not be Governor of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal, but that a separate governor should be appointed for that presidency, and in that case a governor was to be appointed in like manner as the governors of Madras and Bombay, and the governor-general's power of appointing a deputy-governor of Bengal was to cease. But unless and until a separate governor of the presidency was so constituted, the Governor-General in Council might appoint any servant of the Company who had been ten years in its service in India to be lieutenant-governor of such part of the territories under the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal as, for the time being, might not be under the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces. The project of constituting a new governorship was abandoned, and under the alternative power a lieutenant-governor of the Lower Provinces of Bengal (now commonly known as Bengal) was appointed in 1854. In October, 1905, a new province was formed by detaching the eastern part of Bengal from the rest of the province and uniting it with Assam under a lieutenant-governor. See Act VII of 1905.

(b) The lieutenant-governorship of the North-Western Provinces was of earlier date than the lieutenant-governorship of Bengal, and was constituted under an Act of 1835 (5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52). The Act of 1833 had directed the division of the Presidency of Bengal into two distinct presidencies, one to be styled the Presidency of Fort William, the other the Presidency of Agra. The Act of 1835 authorized the Court of Directors to suspend these provisions, and directed that during the period of suspension the Governor-General in Council might appoint any servant of the Company who had been ten years in its

TABLE OF DATES

xix

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1715-74. Louis XV.	1719. New French East India Company.
1716-20. Law's 'system.'	1722. Charles VI grants charter to Ostend Company.
1720. South Sea Bubble.	1725. Charter of Ostend Company withdrawn.
1721-42. Walpole, Prime Minister.	1726. Municipal charters granted to Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. Mayors' courts established in each place.
1725. Death of Peter the Great.	1728. Danish Company extinguished.
1727. George II.	1731. Swedish India Company formed.
1732. Colony of Georgia founded.	1739. Invasion of India by Nâdir Shâh.
1740-4. Anson's voyages.	1742. Aliverdi Khan, Nawab of Bengal.
1740-8. Wars of the Austrian Succession.	1746. Labourdonnais takes Madras.
1740-86. Frederick II of Prussia.	1748. English besiege Pondicherry. Madras restored to English by treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.
1744. Pelham, Prime Minister.	1749-54. War of succession in the Carnatic.
1745-6. Rebellion in Scotland.	1750-4. War between French and English Companies.
1748. Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.	1751. Clive seizes Arcot.
1754. Duke of Newcastle, Prime Minister.	1752. French surrender Trichinopoly.
1756-61. The elder Pitt directs foreign policy of England.	1753. New charters granted to Presidency towns.
1756-63. Seven Years' War.	1754. French recall Dupleix. Treaty of peace signed at Pondicherry.
	Mutiny Act (27 Geo. II, c. 9) passed for Indian forces.
	1756. Surâj-ud-doulâ becomes Nawab of Bengal and (June) takes Calcutta. (Black Hole Massacre.) Rupture between France and England.
	1757 (January). Clive recovers Calcutta.
	(June 23.) Battle of Plassey.
	1758. Lally's expedition reaches India.—Lally besieges Madras. Marâthâ invasion of Punjab.

appointment of a council for either or both of those provinces, and whilst any such order is in force the governor of the province to which the order refers has all the powers of the Governor thereof in Council (*d*).

(*a*) It seems desirable to avoid the term 'presidency,' which dates from a time when British India was divided into three presidencies. But the Governments of Madras and Bombay occupy a position different from and superior to that of the other local Governments. The governor is appointed by the Crown, and not by the governor-general; he is assisted by an executive council, and he retains the right of communicating directly with the Secretary of State (above, s. 15).

(*b*) e. g. to the control of the governor-general.

(*c*) Before the Act of 1858 the appointments were made by the Court of Directors with the approval of the Crown.

(*d*) This power was given by the Act of 1833, but has never been exercised.

51.—(1) The ordinary (*a*) members of the councils of the governors of Madras and Bombay are appointed by His Majesty by warrant under the royal sign manual.

(2) The number of the ordinary members of each of the said councils is such number not exceeding three as the Secretary of State directs (*b*).

(3) Every ordinary member of the said councils must be a person who at the time of his appointment has been for at least twelve years in the service of the Crown in India (*c*).

(4) Provided that if the commander-in-chief of His Majesty's forces in India (not being likewise governor-general) happens to be resident at Madras or Bombay he is, during his continuance there, a member of the governor's council (*d*).

(*a*) The commanders-in-chief of the Madras and Bombay armies might be appointed, and, in fact, were always appointed, extraordinary members of the Madras and Bombay Councils. But these offices were abolished by the Madras and Bombay Armies Act, 1893 (56 & 57 Vict. c. 62). The term 'ordinary' is used in this section by way of distinction from additional or legislative members (see s. 60).

(*b*) The number was reduced from three to two in 1833, and is now two.

(*c*) The qualification under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 25, is twelve years' residence in India in the service of the East India Company. The

Ordinary
members
of coun-
cils.

[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
ss. 24, 25.

3 & 4
Will. IV,
c. 85, ss.

56, 57-
32 & 33
Vict. c.
97, s. 8.]

[33 Geo.
III, c. 52,
s. 33.]

TABLE OF DATES

xvii

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1624-42. Richelieu first minister of France.	1623-4 (February). East India Company authorized to grant their officers power of executing martial law.
1625. Charles I.	1628-58. Shah Jahān.
1628. Charter granted to Massachusetts Company.	1634. English permitted to trade throughout the dominions of the Mogul.
1632. Battle of Lutzen.—Death of Gustavus Adolphus.	1639. Madras bought by East India Company. — Fort St. George built.
1642-9. Civil War in England.	1640. East India Company's factory at Hugli.
1643-1715. Louis XIV.	
1648. Peace of Westphalia.—End of Thirty Years' War.	1657. Cromwell's charter to East India Company.
1649. Commonwealth.	1658. Madras made independent of Bantam.
1651. Navigation Act.	1658-1707. Aurangzeb.
1651-4. First war between England and Holland.	1661. English get Bombay as part of dowry of Catherine of Braganza.
1652. Dutch East India Company establish a station at the Cape.	(April 3.) Charles II grants charter to East India Company.
1653. Oliver Cromwell, Protector.	1664. Sivaji becomes Raja of Marathas.
1655. Capture of Jamaica.	Defence of Surat against Sivaji.
	French East India Company (Colbert's) established.
1660. Charles II.	1669. Charles II gives Bombay to East India Company.
Navigation Act renewed.	1677. Charter granting Company powers of coinage.
1664. New York taken from the Dutch.	1679. Aurangzeb at war with the Rajputs.
1665-7. Second war between England and Holland.	1680. Death of Sivaji.
1667. Treaty of Breda.	1681. Bengal made a separate presidency.
1672-4. Third war between England and Holland.	

tive examinations were framed by Lord Macaulay's committee in 1854, and have since been modified from time to time. Under the existing rules the limits of age for candidates are from twenty-one to twenty-three. Successful candidates remain on probation for one year, and then have to pass an examination in subjects specially connected with their future duties. If they pass, they receive their appointments from the Secretary of State. Probationers are encouraged by a special allowance of £100 to pass their probationary year at a University or College approved by the Secretary of State.

The Indian Civil Service Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 54), whilst validating certain irregular appointments which had been made in the past, expressly reserved in the future to members of the covenanted service all the more important civil posts under the rank of member of council in the regulation provinces. The schedule of reserved posts, which is still in force¹, does not apply to non-regulation provinces, such as the Punjab, Oudh, the Central Provinces, and Burma, where the higher civil posts may be, and in practice often are, filled by military officers belonging to the Indian Army, and others.

An Act of 1870 (33 Vict. c. 3), after reciting that 'it is expedient that additional facilities should be given for the employment of natives of India, of proved merit and ability, in the civil service of Her Majesty in India,' authorized the appointment of any native of India to any office, place, or employment in the civil service in India, without reference to any statutory restriction, but subject to rules to be made by the Governor-General in Council with the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council².

Little was done under this Act until rules for regulating appointments under it were made during Lord Lytton's government in 1879. The intention was that about a sixth of the posts reserved by law to the covenanted civil service should be filled by natives of India appointed under these rules; and for the purpose of giving gradual effect to this

statutory description is 'the Governor-General in Council at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations.' It was constituted by the Indian Councils Act, 1861, in supersession of the legislative body established under the Act of 1853, and its constitution was modified by the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14). The qualification of residence in India was added by the Act of 1892.

(b) The number under the Act of 1861 was not less than six nor more than twelve. It was increased by the Act of 1892.

(c) As to the effect of these regulations, see above, pp. 115, 116.

61.—(1) The legislative meetings of the governor-general's council are held at such times and places as the Governor-General in Council appoints (a).

(2) Any such meeting may be adjourned by the governor-general, or by the person presiding at the meeting if so authorized by the governor-general (b).

(a) In practice the meetings are held at Calcutta and Simla. There are no legislative sessions, but meetings are held whenever it is considered convenient. A Bill remains in life until it is passed or withdrawn, or is treated under the rules of business as dropped. All the Acts passed in any one calendar year are numbered in consecutive order (Act I of 1897 and so on).

(b) It would be more convenient to make the power of adjournment exercisable by the person presiding, without further authority.

62.—(1) At every legislative meeting of the governor-general's council the governor-general, or the president of the governor-general's council (a), or some other ordinary member of the governor-general's council, and at least six other members, ordinary or additional, of that council, must be present.

(2) At every such meeting the governor-general, or in his absence the president of the governor-general's council, or if there is no president, or if the president is absent, the senior ordinary member of the governor-general's council present at the meeting presides.

(3) The person presiding at a legislative meeting of the governor-general's council has a second or casting vote.

(a) See s. 45.

Times and
places of
legislative
meetings.
[24 & 25
Vict. c.
67, s. 17.]

Constitu-
tion of
legislative
meetings
of council.
[24 & 25
Vict. c. 67,
s. 15.]

The Board of Control was formally abolished. With respect to contracts and legal proceedings, the Secretary of State in Council was given a quasi-corporate character for the purpose of enabling him to assert the rights and discharge the liabilities devolving upon him as successor to the East India Company¹.

It has been seen that under the authority given by various Acts the Company raised and maintained separate military forces of their own. The troops belonging to these forces, whilst in India, were governed by a separate Mutiny Act, perpetual in duration, though re-enacted from time to time with amendments². The Company also had a small naval force, once known as the Bombay Marine, but after 1829 as the Indian Navy.

The Act of 1858 transferred to the service of the Crown all the naval and military forces of the Company, retaining, however, their separate local character, with the same liability to local service and the same pay and privileges as if they were in the service of the Company. Many of the European troops refused to acknowledge the authority of Parliament to make this transfer. They demanded re-engagement and bounty as a condition of the transfer of their services³, and, failing to get these terms, were offered their discharge.

In 1860 the existence of European troops as a separate force was put an end to by an Act (23 & 24 Vict. c. 100) which, after reciting that it is not expedient that a separate European force should be continued for the local service of Her Majesty in India, formally repealed the enactments by which the Secretary of State in Council was authorized to give directions for raising such forces.

In 1861 the officers and soldiers formerly belonging to the Company's European forces were invited to join, and many

¹ Digest, s. 35.

² The first of these Acts was an Act of 1753 (27 Geo. II, c. 9), and the last was an Act of 1857 (20 & 21 Vict. c. 66), which was repealed in 1863 (26 & 27 Vict. c. 48).

³ In 1859 they made a 'demonstration' which, from the small stature of the recruits enlisted during the Indian Mutiny, was sometimes called the 'Dumpy Mutiny.' Pritchard, *Administration of India*, i. 36.

In the same year was passed the Royal Titles Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 10), which authorized the Queen to assume the title of Empress of India.

The Indian Salaries and Allowances Act, 1880 (43 & 44 Vict. c. 3), enabled the Secretary of State to regulate by order certain salaries and allowances which had been previously fixed by statute ¹.

The Indian Marine Service Act, 1884 (47 & 48 Vict. c. 38), enabled the Governor-General in Council to legislate for maintaining discipline in a small marine establishment, called Her Majesty's Indian Marine Service, the members of which were neither under the Naval Discipline Act nor under the Merchant Shipping Acts ².

The Council of India Reduction Act, 1889 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 65), authorized the Secretary of State to abstain from filling vacancies in the Council of India until the number should be reduced to ten.

The Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14), authorized an increase in the number of the members of the Indian legislative councils, and empowered the Governor-General in Council, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council, to make rules regulating the conditions under which these members are to be nominated ³. At the same time the Act relaxed the restrictions imposed by the Act of 1861 on the proceedings of the legislative councils by enabling rules to be made authorizing the discussion of the annual financial statement, and the asking of questions, under prescribed conditions and restrictions.

The Act also cleared up a doubt as to the meaning of an enactment in the Indian Councils Act of 1861, modified some of the provisions of that Act about the office of 'additional members' of legislative councils, and enabled local legislatures, with the previous sanction of the governor-general, to repeal

¹ See Digest, 88, 80, 113.

² See *ibid.* 63.

³ See *ibid.* 60, 71, 73.

Council. (2) No local Government may make or issue any order for
 [13 Geo. III, c. 63, s. 9. any treaty of peace or other treaty with any Indian prince or
 33 Geo. III, c. 52, ss. 24, 40, State (except in cases of sudden emergency or imminent
 41, 43, 44, danger when it appears dangerous to postpone such hostilities
 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, or treaty), unless in pursuance of express orders from the
 ss. 65, 67.] Governor-General in Council or from the Secretary of State,
 and every such treaty must, if possible, contain a clause
 subjecting the same to the ratification or rejection of the
 Governor-General in Council.

(3) The authority of a local Government is not superseded
 by the presence in its province of the governor-general (*b*).

(*a*) The expression 'local Government' is defined by s. 124 to mean
 a governor in council, lieutenant-governor, or chief commissioner.
 By the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1807) it is defined to mean
 the person authorized by law to administer executive government
 in the part of British India in which the Act containing the expression
 operates, and to include a chief commissioner. As to the existing local
 Governments, see above, p. 114.

(*b*) This section reproduces enactments which applied to the Govern-
 ments of Madras and Bombay, and were passed with the object of
 maintaining proper control by the Government of Bengal over the
 Governments of the two other presidencies. Of course the circum-
 stances of the present day are widely different. Some of the provisions
 of the enactments reproduced are omitted, as having been made un-
 necessary by the existence of telegraphic communications, and by
 other alterations of circumstances. For instance, it has not been
 considered necessary to reproduce the power of the governor-general
 to suspend a local Government.

Governments of Madras and Bombay.

50.—(1) The provinces (*a*) of Fort St. George and Bombay
 are, subject to the provisions embodied in this Digest (*b*),
 administered by the Governors in Council of Madras and
 Bombay respectively, and are in this Digest referred to as the
 provinces of Madras and Bombay respectively.

(2) The governors of Madras and Bombay are appointed by
 His Majesty by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual (*c*).

(3) The Secretary of State may, if he thinks fit, by order,
 revoke or suspend, for such period as he may direct, the

Govern-
 ments of
 Madras
 and
 Bombay.
 [33 Geo.
 III, c. 52,
 s. 24.
 3 & 4
 Will. IV,
 c. 85, ss.
 56, 57.
 21 & 22
 Vict. c.
 106, s. 29.]

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

	PAGE
Twofold origin of British authority in India	I
Three periods in history of constitutional development	<i>ib.</i>
Landmarks of first period	2
Landmarks of second period	<i>ib.</i>
Landmarks of third period	3
Charter of Elizabeth	<i>ib.</i>
Points of constitutional interest in charter of Elizabeth. Constitu- tion of Company	6
Privileges of Company	7
Legislative powers of Company	9
Resemblance to Massachusetts Company	10
Other English trading companies	11
Russia Company	<i>ib.</i>
Levant Company	12
The separate voyages	13
James I's charter of 1609	<i>ib.</i>
Beginning of martial law exercisable by Company	14
Grant of 1615	<i>ib.</i>
Grant of 1623	<i>ib.</i>
Contests with Dutch and English rivals	15
Massacre of Amboyna	<i>ib.</i>
Courten's Association	<i>ib.</i>
Cromwell's relations to the Company	<i>ib.</i>
Cromwell's charter of 1657	<i>ib.</i>
The Company after the Restoration	16
Charles II's charter of 1661	<i>ib.</i>
Arrangements for administration of justice at Madras in seventeenth century	17
Grant of Bombay to the Company	18
Charter of 1677 granting powers of coinage	19
Administration of justice at Bombay in seventeenth century	<i>ib.</i>
Charter of 1683 giving power to raise forces and exercise martial law, and establishing Courts of Admiralty	<i>ib.</i>
Charter of 1686	20
Establishment of municipality at Madras	21
Charter of 1687	22
Company's resolution of 1689	23
Controversies after Revolution of 1688	24
Charters of 1693 and 1694	25
The affair of the <i>Redbridge</i> and its results	26
Incorporation of English Company	27
Union of Old and New Companies	29

Period between 1708 and 1708	
Extension of Company's charter	
Provisions against interlopers	
Judicial charters of 1720 and 1753	
Mutiny Act and Articles of War for Indian Forces	
Charters of 1757 and 1758 as to booty and cession of territories	
The Company as territorial sovereign	
Grant of the Diwani	
Legislation of 1707	
Pecuniary embarrassments in 1772 ✓	
Legislation of 1773	
The Regulating Act of 1773	
Provisions of Regulating Act	
Charter of 1774 constituting supreme court at Calcutta	
Difficulties arising out of Regulating Act	
Difficulties in the council	
Difficulties between supreme council and supreme court	
Amending Act of 1781	
Further legislation of 1781	
Parliamentary inquiries of 1781	
Fox's East India Bill	
Pitt's Act of 1784	
Legislation of 1786	
Legislation of 1788	
Charter Act of 1793	
Legislation between 1793 and 1813	
Charter Act of 1813	
Legislation between 1813 and 1833	
Charter Act of 1833	
Legislation between 1833 and 1853	
Charter Act of 1853	
Establishment of chief commissionerships	
The Government of India Act, 1858	
The Indian Army	
Legislation of 1861	
Indian Civil Service Act, 1861	
Indian Councils Act, 1861	
Indian High Courts Act, 1861	
Legislation since 1861	

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF EXISTING LAW

Home Government. Secretary of State	
Council of India	
Staff of India Office	
Indian revenues	
Audit	
Contracts and legal proceedings	

CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
Government in India. The governor-general	111
The governor-general's council	<i>ib.</i>
The local governments	114
Indian legislation	115
Local legislatures	118
Indian Law	121
The Civil Service of India	123
The chartered high courts	126
Jurisdiction of English courts over offences in India	128
The army in India	129
Ecclesiastical establishment	131
Subsidiary provisions	<i>ib.</i>
Administrative arrangements not dependent on Acts of Parliament	132
Financial system	133
Administrative staff of local governments	134
Regulation and non-regulation provinces	135
The district	<i>ib.</i>
The district magistrate and his staff	<i>ib.</i>
Municipal and district councils	136
Judicial arrangements	<i>ib.</i>
Civil jurisdiction	137
Criminal jurisdiction	<i>ib.</i>
The Native States	139
Division of sovereignty	<i>ib.</i>
General control by British Government	<i>ib.</i>
Control over foreign relations	140
Power to maintain peace	141
Special responsibility for British subjects in Native States	<i>ib.</i>
Subordinate military co-operation	142
Exceptional position of Native Indian States	144

CHAPTER III

DIGEST OF STATUTORY ENACTMENTS RELATING TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PART I.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE IN COUNCIL.

SECTION

The Crown.

1. Government of India by the Crown	144
-------------------------------------	-----

The Secretary of State.

2. The Secretary of State	145
---------------------------	-----

The Council of India.

3. The Council of India	146
4. Seat in council disqualification for Parliament	148
5. Claims to compensation	<i>ib.</i>
6. Duties of council	<i>ib.</i>
7. Powers of council	<i>ib.</i>

GAZARBOYN
YIARBLI ITATS LONDON

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.

PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



AND

STEVENS & SONS, LIMITED

A. No.	1900
Class No.	H.65.
Book No.	23

territorial revenues up to March 1 in that year, and their former privileges were extended until three years' notice after March 1, 1791. By the same Act they were authorized to pay a dividend of 8 per cent. out of their clear profits, but three-fourths of the remainder were to go as a tribute to the public.

By way of repayment of the military expenses incurred by the State on their behalf, the Company were required to pay two lacs of rupees annually for each regiment of 1,000 men sent to India at the Company's desire. The Act further authorized the Company to enlist soldiers¹, and punish deserters, and prohibited British subjects from residing more than ten miles from any of the Company's principal settlements without a special licence.

Parliamentary
inquiries
of 1781.

Two Parliamentary committees on Indian affairs were appointed in the year 1781. The object of the first, of which Burke was the most prominent member, was to consider the administration of justice in India. Its first fruits were the passing of the Act, to which reference has been made above, for further defining the powers of the supreme court. But it continued to sit for many years and presented several reports, some written by Burke himself. The other committee, which sat in secret, and of which Dundas was chairman, was instructed to inquire into the cause of the recent war in the Carnatic and the state of the British government on the coast. This committee did not publish its report until 1782, by which time Lord North's Government had been driven out of office by the disastrous results of the American war, and had been succeeded by the second Rockingham ministry. The reports of both committees were highly adverse to the system of administration in India, and to the persons responsible for that administration, and led to the passing of resolutions by the House of Commons requiring the recall of Hastings and Impey, and declaring that the powers given

¹ This was the first Act giving Parliamentary sanction to the raising of European troops by the Company. Clode, *Military Forces of the Crown*, i. 269.

ment of a lieutenant-governor for the North-Western Provinces¹. The project of establishing an executive council for the Bengal and North-Western Provinces was abandoned.

An Act of 1840 (3 & 4 Viet. c. 37) consolidated and amended the Indian Mutiny Acts, and empowered the Governor-General in Council to make regulations for the Indian Navy.

An Act of 1848 (11 & 12 Viet. c. 21) enacted for India a law of insolvency, which is still in force in the presidency towns.

Charter
Act of
1853.

In 1853, during the governor-generalship of Lord Dalhousie, it became necessary to take steps for renewing the term of twenty years which had been created by the Act of 1833, and accordingly the last of the Charter Acts (16 & 17 Viet. c. 95) was passed in that year.

It differed from the previous Charter Acts by not fixing any definite term for the continuance of the powers, but simply providing that the Indian territories should remain under the government of the Company, in trust for the Crown, until Parliament should otherwise direct.

The Act reduced the number of the directors of the Company from twenty-four to eighteen, and provided that six of these should be appointed by the Crown.

It continued indefinitely, until the Court of Directors and Board of Control should otherwise direct, the suspension of the division of the Bengal Presidency contemplated by the Act of 1835, but authorized the appointment of a separate governor for that presidency, distinct from the governor-general². However, the Act went on to provide that, unless and until this separate governor was appointed, the Court of Directors and Board of Control might authorize the appointment of a lieutenant-governor of Bengal. The power of appointing a separate governor was never brought into

¹ The first appointment was made in 1830.

² Under the Act of 1833 the Governor-General of India was also Governor of Bengal, but during his frequent absences from Calcutta used to delegate his functions in the latter capacity to the senior member of his council. See the evidence of Sir Herbert Maddock and Mr. P. Millett before the select committee of the House of Lords in 1851.

and for increasing and further defining the powers of superintendence and direction exercised by the Board of Control.

The patronage of the Company is preserved, subject to the approval of the Crown in the case of the higher offices, and of the Board of Control in certain other cases.

The number of king's troops to be paid for out of the Company's revenues is not to exceed 20,000, except in case of special requisition. In order to remove doubts it is expressly declared that the Government in India may make laws, regulations, and articles of war for their native troops, and provide for the holding of courts-martial.

The local Governments are also empowered to impose taxes on persons subject to the jurisdiction of the supreme court, and to punish for non-payment.

Justices of the peace are to have jurisdiction in cases of assault or trespass committed by British subjects on natives of India, and also in cases of small debts due to natives from British subjects. Special provision is made for the exercise of jurisdiction in criminal cases over British subjects residing more than ten miles from a presidency town; and British subjects residing or trading, or occupying immovable property, more than ten miles from a presidency town are to be subject to the jurisdiction of the local civil courts.

And, finally, special penalties are enacted for theft, forgery, perjury, and coinage offences, the existing provisions of the common or statute law being apparently considered insufficient for dealing adequately with these offences.

The imperial legislation for India during the interval between 1813 and 1833 does not present many features of importance.

An Act of 1814¹ removed doubts as to the powers of the Indian Government to levy duties of customs and other taxes.

in the first instance, be employed in securing the regular payment of dividends to the proprietors of stock, and should then be applied for the benefit of the territory. The last-mentioned applications to be suspended only so long as the burden of debt on the territory continued below a certain specified amount.

¹ 54 Geo. III, c. 105.

and officers over them and to give them power and authority, by commission under their common seal or otherwise, to continue or make peace or war with any people that are not Christians, in any places of their trade, as shall be for the most advantage and benefit of the said Governor and Company, and of their trade.' They were further empowered to erect fortifications, and supply them with provisions and ammunition, duty free, 'as also to transport and carry over such number of men, being willing thereunto, as they shall think fit,' to govern them in a legal and reasonable manner, to punish them for misdemeanour, and to fine them for breach of orders. They might seize unlicensed persons and send them to England, punish persons in their employment for offences, and in case of their appealing against the sentence seize them and send them as prisoners to England, there to receive such condign punishment as the merits of the offenders' cause should require, and the laws of the nation should allow.

With regard to the administration of justice, nothing appears to have been done towards carrying into effect the provisions of the charter of 1661 till the year 1678. At Madras, which was at that time the chief of the Company's settlements in India¹, two or more officers of the Company used before 1678 to sit as justices in the 'choultry' to dispose of petty cases, but there was no machinery for dealing with serious crimes².

In 1678 the agent and council at Madras resolved that, under the charter of 1661, they had power to judge all persons living under them in all cases, whether criminal or civil, according to the English laws, and to execute judgement accordingly, and it was determined that the governor and council should sit in the chapel in the fort on every Wednesday and Saturday to hear and judge all causes. But this high

¹ The settlement of Madras or Fort St. George had been erected into a Presidency in 1651.

² See Wheeler, *Madras in Olden Times*.

of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the Company.' The policy of freely admitting natives of India to a share in the administration of the country has never been more broadly or emphatically enunciated.

And finally, the Governor-General in Council was required forthwith to take into consideration the means of mitigating the state of slavery, and of ameliorating the condition of slaves, and of extinguishing slavery throughout the Indian territories so soon as such extinction should be practicable and safe, and to prepare and submit to the Court of Directors drafts of laws on the subject¹. In preparing these drafts due regard was to be had to the laws of marriage and the rights and authorities of fathers and heads of families.

The sections of the Act which follow these broad declarations of policy are concerned mainly with regulations relating to the ecclesiastical establishments in India and increasing the number of bishoprics to three, and with regulations for the college of Haileybury.

The Act of 1833, as sent out to India, was accompanied by an explanatory dispatch from the Court of Directors, which, according to a tradition in the India Office, was drafted by James Mill².

During the twenty years' interval between the Charter Act of 1833 and that of 1853 there was very little Parliamentary legislation on India.

An Act of 1835 (5 & 6 Will. IV, c. 52) suspended the provisions of the Act of 1833 as to the division of the Presidency of Bengal into two presidencies³, and authorized the appoint-

¹ See Act V of 1843 and ss. 370, 371 of the Indian Penal Code. See also Mr. Cameron's evidence before the select committee of the House of Lords in 1852, and Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 92.

² Kaye, *Administration of the East India Company*, p. 137.

³ By s. 15 of the Charter Act of 1833 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95) this suspension was continued until the Court of Directors and Board of Control should otherwise direct.

Legisla-
tion
between
1833 and
1853.

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1759. Wolfe takes Quebec.	1759. Lally raises siege of Madras. —Defeat of Dutch in Bengal.
1760. George III.	1760. Coote defeats Lally at Wandewash. Clive returns to England.
	1760-5. Period of misrule in Bengal.
1762. Bute, Prime Minister. Catherine, Empress of Russia.	1761. Coote takes Pondicherry.— Fall of the French power in Deccan. Ahmed Shah defeats Maráthás at Battle of Paniput.
1763. Peace of Paris.—End of Seven Years' War. George Grenville, Prime Minister.	1763. Pondicherry restored to France (Peace of Paris). Massacre of English prisoners at Patna.
	1764 (October 23). Battle of Baxar.
1765. Stamp Act passed. (July.) Rockingham, Prime Minister.—Stamp Act repealed.	1765. Clive returns to India, accepts Diwani of Bengal for the Company, makes treaties of alliance with Oudh and the Mogul emperor.
1766 (July). Duke of Grafton, Prime Minister.	1766. Grant of Northern Sarkars to Company. (November.) Parliamentary inquiry into affairs of Company.
	1767-9. First war of English with Hyder Ali.
	1767. Clive finally leaves India. Acts of Parliament relating to East India Company (7 Geo. III, cc. 48, 49, 56, 57). Power to declare dividend restrained. Company to pay £400,000 annually into Exchequer.
1768-71. Captain Cook circumnavigated the world.	1768. Restraint on dividend continued (8 Geo. III, c. 11). The Nizám cedes the Carnatic.
	1769. New arrangement for five years between Government and Company. Payment of annuity of £400,000 continued (9 Geo. III, c. 24).
1770. Lord North, Prime Minister. —Disturbance at Boston.	1770. Famine in Bengal. 1771 (August 28). Company resolve to 'stand forth as Diwan' of Bengal.

INDEX

A.

Absence, leave of, to members of council, 132, 226.
 — from India of governor, vacates office, 132, 226.
Accounts of Secretary of State, 161, 164.
 — of revenues to be laid before Parliament, 164.
Act of State, as defence in judicial proceedings, 171-175.
Actions against Secretary of State, 170-175.
Adalat. *See* Sadr Adalat.
Additional judge, 138.
 — members of council, of governor-general, 115, 116, 197; of Madras or Bombay, 119, 213, 214.
Aden, part of British India, 264; Jewish law, 338.
Admiralty jurisdiction, 20, 21, 22, 46, 241, 242-244.
Advocate-general, additional member of legislative council, 214; appointment and powers of, 251.
African protectorates, law applied to, 372-377.
Agra, proposed presidency of, 83, 89, 191, 192.
Aldermen, at Madras, 22, 23, 32; at Bombay and Calcutta, 32.
Allahabad, high court, 104, 126.
Allegiance, prohibition on legislation affecting, 200.
Allowances to certain officials, 224, 225.
Amalgamation of Indian and Royal army, 97, 98.
Ambayna, massacre of, 15.
Anson, Sir W., referred to or quoted, 68, 98, 146, 159, 161, 166, 175.
Appeals, 32, 48, 127, 137, 139.
Appointments by Secretary of State, 153, 154.
Archdeacons, first appointment of, 78; salaries of, 131, 253.
Armenians, law regarding, 330.
Army, first sepoys raised, 33, 267; Company authorized to enlist soldiers, 60; further powers for raising European troops, 72; restriction on legislature, 117, 208, 219; constitution of, 129-131; military commissions, 267-271.

Arrest, exemption from, of high officials, 247, 248.
Articles of War, 33, 34, 205.
Assada Company, the = Courten's Association, 15.
Assam, chief commissionership, 93, 114; legislative council, 118, 119, 215; subordinate civil courts, 137; constitution of government, 191-196; legislation, 203.
Assent of governor-general to all Acts, 209, 222; of governor or lieutenant-governor to local Acts, 222.
Assessors, trial by, 138.
Assurances of property, in England, 167; in India, 168.
Audit of India accounts in England, 165, 166.

B.

Benares, jurisdiction of supreme court extended to, 72; Bengal Regulations extended to, 101.
Bencoolen (Fort Marlborough), presidency of, 45.
Bengal, establishment of English government, 34-37, 42, 43; appointment of governor-general, 44; supremacy over other presidencies, 45; intended division of presidency, 83; appointment of lieutenant-governor, 90; creation of legislative council, 103; subordinate civil courts, 137.
Bengal, Eastern, union with Assam, 191.
 — Regulations, 43, 58, 59, 71, 84, 101, 121.
Berar, not part of British India, 113, 393.
Bills of exchange, law regarding, 334, 335.
Birthplace, no disqualification for office, 89, 234.
Bishop, first appointment of, 72, 131; legislation affecting, 252-254.
Board of Control, first established, 62, 63; remodelled, 69; abolished, 97.
 — of Revenue, first established, 43; in Bengal, Madras, Assam, and United Provinces, 134.

court was not to supersede the justices of the choultry, who were still to hear and decide petty cases.

✓ Grant of
Bombay
to the
Company.

In the meantime the port and island of Bombay, which had, in 1661, been ceded to the British Crown as a part of the dowry of Catherine of Braganza, were, by a charter of 1669, granted to the East India Company to be held of the Crown, 'as of the Manor of Greenwich in free and common socage,' for the annual rent of £10.

And by the same charter the Company were authorized to take into their service such of the king's officers and soldiers as should then be on the island, and should be willing to serve them. The officers and men who volunteered their services under this power became the cadets of the Company's '1st European Regiment,' or 'Bombay Fusiliers,' afterwards the 103rd Foot.

✓ The Company were authorized, through their court of committees, to make laws, orders, ordinances, and constitutions for the good government and otherwise of the port and island and of the inhabitants thereof and, by their governors and other officers, to exercise judicial authority, and have power and authority of government or command, in the island, and to repel any force which should attempt to inhabit its precincts without licence, or to annoy the inhabitants. Moreover, the principal governor of the island was empowered 'to use and exercise all those powers and authorities, in cases of rebellion, mutiny, or sedition, of refusing to serve in wars, flying to the enemy, forsaking colours or ensigns, or other offences against law, custom, and discipline military, in as large and ample manner, to all intents and purposes whatsoever, as any captain-general of our army by virtue of his office has used and accustomed, and may or might lawfully do.'

The transition of the Company from a trading association to a territorial sovereign invested with powers of civil and military government is very apparent in these provisions.

Further attributes of sovereignty were soon afterwards conferred

By a charter of 1677 the Company were empowered to coin money at Bombay to be called by the name of 'rupees, pices, and budbrooks,' or such other names as the Company might think fit. These coins were to be current in the East Indies, but not in England. A mint for the coinage of pagodas had been established at Madras some years before.

Charter of 1677 granting powers of coinage.

The commissioners sent from Surat¹ to take possession of Bombay on behalf of the Company made a report in which they requested that a judge-advocate might be appointed, as the people were accustomed to civil law. Apparently, as a temporary measure, two courts of judicature were formed, the inferior court consisting of a Company's civil officer assisted by two native officers, and having limited jurisdiction, and the supreme court consisting of the deputy governor and council, whose decisions were to be final and without appeal, except in cases of the greatest necessity.

Administration of justice at Bombay in seventeenth century.

By a charter of 1683, the Company were given full power to declare and make peace and war with any of the 'heathen nations' being natives of the parts of Asia and America mentioned in the charter, and to 'raise, arm, train, and muster such military forces as to them shall seem requisite and necessary; and to execute and use, within the said plantations, forts, and places, the law called the martial law, for the defence of the said forts, places, and plantations against any foreign invasion or domestic insurrection or rebellion.' But this power was subject to a proviso reserving to the Crown 'the sovereign right, powers, and dominion over all the forts and places of habitation,' and 'power of making peace and war, when we shall be pleased to interpose our royal authority thereon.'

Charter of 1683 giving power to raise forces and exercise martial law, and establishing Court of Admiralty.

By the same charter the king established a court of judicature, to be held at such place or places as the Company might direct, and to consist of 'one person learned in the

¹ Bombay was then subordinate to Surat, where a factory had been established as early as 1612, and where there was a president with a council of eight members.

✓ civil law, and two assistants,' to be appointed by the Company. The court was to have power to hear and determine all cases of forfeiture of ships or goods trading contrary to the charter, and also all mercantile and maritime cases concerning persons coming to or being in the places aforesaid, and all cases of trespasses, injuries, and wrongs done or committed upon the high seas or in any of the regions, territories, countries or places aforesaid, concerning any persons residing, being, or coming within the limits of the Company's charter. These cases were to be adjudged and determined by the court, according to the rules of equity and good conscience, and according to the laws and customs of merchants, by such procedure as they might direct, and, subject to any such directions as the judges of the court should, in their best judgement and discretion, think meet and just.

✓ The only person learned in the civil law who was sent out to India in pursuance of the charter of 1683 was Dr. John St. John. By a commission from the king, supplemented by a commission from the Company, he was appointed judge of the court at Surat. But he soon became involved in disputes with the governor, Sir John Child¹, who limited his jurisdiction to maritime cases, and appointed a separate judge for civil actions.

At Madras, the president of the council was appointed to supply the place of judge-advocate till one should arrive. But this arrangement caused much dissatisfaction, and it was resolved that, instead of the president's accepting this appointment, the old court of judicature should be continued, and that, until the arrival of a judge-advocate, causes should be heard under it as formerly in accordance with the charter of 1661.

[- Charter of 1686.

In 1686 James II granted the Company a charter by which he renewed and confirmed their former privileges, and authorized them to appoint 'admirals, vice-admirals, rear-admirals, captains, and other sea officers' in any of the

¹ A brother of Sir Josiah Child.

✓ Charter of
1687.

Accordingly the charter of 1687, which established a municipality and mayor's court at Madras, proceeds from the Company, and not from the Crown. It recites 'the approbation of the king, declared in His Majesty's Cabinet Council¹ the eleventh day of this instant December,' and then goes on to constitute a municipality according to the approved English type. The municipal corporation is to consist of a mayor, twelve aldermen, and sixty or more burgesses. The mayor and aldermen are to have power to levy taxes for the building of a convenient town house or guild hall, of a public gaol, and of a school-house 'for the teaching of the Gentues or native children to speak, read, and write the English tongue, and to understand arithmetick and merchants' accompts, and for such further ornaments and edifices as shall be thought convenient for the honour, interest, ornament, security, and defence' of the corporation, and of the inhabitants of Madras, and for the payment of the salaries of the necessary municipal officers, including a schoolmaster. The mayor and aldermen are to be a court of record, with power to try civil and criminal causes, and the mayor and three of the aldermen are to be justices of the peace. There is to be an appeal in civil and criminal cases from the mayor's court to 'our supreme court of judicature, commonly called our court of admiralty.' There is to be a recorder, who must be a discreet person, skilful in the laws and constitutions of the place, and who is to assist the mayor in trying, judging, and sentencing causes of any considerable value or intricacy. And there is to be a town clerk and clerk of the peace, an able and discreet person, who must always be an Englishman born, but well skilled in the language of East India, and who is to be esteemed a notary public.

Nor are the ornamental parts of municipal life forgotten. 'For the greater solemnity and to attract respect and rever-

¹ This formal recognition of the existence of a cabinet council is of constitutional interest. But of course the cabinet council of 1687 was a very different thing from the cabinet council of the present day.

ence from the common people,' the mayor is to 'always have carried before him when he goes to the guild hall or other place of assembly, two silver maces gilt, not exceeding three feet and a half in length,' and the mayor and aldermen may 'always upon such solemn occasions wear scarlet serge gowns, all made after one form or fashion, such as shall be thought most convenient for that hot country.' The burgesses are, on these occasions, to wear white 'pelong,' or other silk gowns. Moreover, the mayor and aldermen are 'to have and for ever enjoy the honour and privilege of having rundelloes and kattysols¹ born over them when they walk or ride abroad on these necessary occasions within the limits of the said corporation, and, when they go to the guild hall or upon any other solemn occasion, they may ride on horseback in the same order as is used by the Lord Mayor and aldermen of London, having their horses decently furnished with saddles, bridles, and other trimmings after one form and manner as shall be devised and directed by our President and Council of Fort St. George.'

The charter of 1687 was the last of the Stuart charters affecting the East India Company. The constitutional history of the Company after the Revolution of 1688 may be appropriately ushered in by a reference to the resolution which was passed by them in that year.

Com-
pany's
resolution
of 1689. } 11

'The increase of our revenue is the subject of our care as much as our trade; 'tis that must maintain our force when twenty accidents may interrupt our trade; 'tis that must make us a nation in India; without that we are but a great number of interlopers, united by His Majesty's royal charter, fit only to trade where nobody of power thinks it their interest to prevent us; and upon this account it is that the wise Dutch, in all their general advices that we have seen, write ten paragraphs concerning their government, their civil and military policy, warfare, and the increase of their revenue, for one paragraph they write concerning trade.'

¹ Umbrellas and parasols.

TABLE OF DATES

XXV

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1841 (September 6). Sir R. Peel, Prime Minister.	1841. Insurrection at Cabul and disastrous retreat of British troops.
	1842-4. Lord Ellenborough, Governor-General.
	1842. Pollock recaptures and evacuates Cabul.
	1843. Annexation of Sind (Battle of Meeanee).—Capture of Gwalior.
	1844-8. Lord Hardinge, Governor-General.
	1845. Danish possessions bought.
	1845-6. Sikh War. Battles of Múdkí and Ferozeshah (1845).
	1846. Battles of Aliwal and Sohraon.—Treaty of Lahore.
1846. Repeal of Corn Laws. (June.) Sir R. Peel resigns. (July 6.) Lord John Russell, Prime Minister.	1848-56. Lord Dalhousie, Governor-General.
1848. Chartist riots.—Revolution in France.	1849. Satára annexed.—Second Sikh War. Battles of Chillianwallah and Goojerat.—Punjab annexed.
	1850. Bombay Railway commenced.
1852. Louis Napoleon, Emperor. (February 27.) Lord Derby, Prime Minister. (December 28.) Lord Aberdeen, Prime Minister.	1852. Second Burmese War.—Pegu annexed.
	1853. Last Charter Act (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95) passed; remodels constitution of Legislative Council.
	Jhánsi, the Berars, and Nagpur annexed. — Telegraphs commenced.
1854-5. Crimean War.	1854. Bengal constituted a Lieutenant-Governorship.
1855 (February 10). Lord Palmerston, Prime Minister.	1856. Oudh annexed.
1856. Treaty of Paris.	1856-62. Lord Canning, Governor-General.
	1857-8. Indian Mutiny. — Outbreaks at Meerut and Delhi (June). Delhi taken (September). First relief of Lucknow by Havelock and Outram (September). Final relief of Lucknow by Sir Colin Campbell (November).

far as they were suitable to the circumstances of the country ¹. And when the Punjab was annexed the view taken was that the Governor-General in Council had power to make laws for the new territory, not in accordance with the forms prescribed by the Charter Acts for legislation, but by executive orders, corresponding to the Orders in Council made by the Crown for what are called Crown Colonies. Provinces in which this power was exercised were called 'non-regulation provinces' to distinguish them from the 'regulation provinces,' which were governed by regulations formally made under the Charter Acts. A large body of laws had been passed under this power or assumed power, and in order to remove any doubts as to their validity a section was introduced into the Indian Councils Act, 1861, declaring that no rule, law, or regulation made before the passing of the Act by the governor-general or certain other authorities should be deemed invalid by reason of not having been made in conformity with the provisions of the Charter Acts ².

The power of legislation which had been taken away from the Governments of Madras and Bombay by the Charter Act of 1833 was restored to them by the Act of 1861. The councils of the governors of Madras and Bombay were expanded for legislative purposes by the addition of the advocate-general and of other members nominated on the same principles as the additional members of the governor-general's council ³. No line of demarcation was drawn between the subjects reserved for the central and the local legislatures respectively; but the previous sanction of the governor-general was made requisite for legislation by the local legislature in certain

¹ Chesney's *Indian Polity* (3rd ed.), pp. 58, 64.

² Indian legislation subsequently became necessary for the purpose of ascertaining and determining the rules which had been thus validated in general terms. See Sir James Stephen's speech in the Legislative Council in the debate on the Punjab Laws Acts, March 26, 1872, and the chapter contributed by him to Sir W. Hunter's *Life of Lord Mayo*, vol. ii. pp. 214-221.

³ These provisions have also been modified by the Act of 1892. See Digest, ss. 71, 76, 77

cases, and all Acts of the local legislature required the subsequent assent of the governor-general in addition to that of the Secretary of State, and were made subject to disallowance by the Crown, as in the case of the governor-general's council. There were also the same restrictions on the proceedings of the local legislatures¹.

The governor-general was directed to establish, by proclamation, a legislative council for Bengal², and was empowered to establish similar councils for the North-Western Provinces and for the Punjab³. These councils were to consist of the lieutenant-governor and of a certain number of nominated councillors, and were to be subject to the same provisions as the local legislatures for Madras and Bombay.

The Act also gave power to constitute new provinces for legislative purposes and appoint new lieutenant-governors, and to alter the boundaries of existing provinces⁴.

The amalgamation of the supreme and *sadr* courts, that is Indian to say, of the courts representing the Crown and the Company ^{High Courts} respectively at the presidency towns, had long been in con- ^{Act, 1861}templation, and was carried into effect by the Indian High Courts Act, 1861⁵.

By this Act the Queen was empowered to establish, by letters patent⁶, high courts of judicature in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and on their establishment the old chartered supreme courts and the old 'Sadr Adalat' Courts were to be abolished, the jurisdiction and the powers of the abolished courts being transferred to the new high courts.

Each of the high courts was to consist of a chief justice and not more than fifteen judges, of whom not less than one-

¹ See note 4, p. 100.

² A legislative council for Bengal was established by a proclamation of January 18, 1862.

³ A legislative council was established for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh (now United Provinces of Agra and Oudh) in 1886, and for the Punjab in 1897.

⁴ ss. 40, 47. Digest, s. 74.

⁵ 24 & 25 Vict. c. 104.

⁶ The letters patent or charters now in force with respect to these three high courts bear date December 28, 1865.

third, including the chief justice, were to be barristers, and not less than one-third were to be members of the covenanted civil service. All the judges were to be appointed by and to hold office during the pleasure of the Crown. The high courts were expressly given superintendence over, and power to frame rules of practice for, all the courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction ¹.

Power was given by the Act to establish another high court, with the same constitution and powers as the high courts established at the presidency towns ².

Legislation since
1861.

The Indian High Courts Act of 1861 closed the series of constitutional statutes consequent on the transfer of the government of India to the Crown. Such Acts of Parliament as have since then been passed for India have done little more than amend, with reference to minor points, the Acts of 1858 and 1861.

The Indian High Courts Act, 1865 ³, empowered the Governor-General in Council to pass orders altering the limits of the jurisdiction of the several chartered high courts and enabling them to exercise their jurisdiction over native Christian subjects of Her Majesty resident in Native States.

Another Act of the same year, the Government of India Act, 1865 ⁴, extended the legislative powers of the governor-general's council to all British subjects in Native States, whether servants of the Crown or not ⁵, and enabled the Governor-General in Council to define and alter, by proclamation, the territorial limits of the various presidencies and lieutenant-governorships ⁶.

The Government of India Act, 1869 ⁷, vested in the Secretary of State the right of filling all vacancies in the Council of India, and changed the tenure of members of the council

¹ See Digest, ss. 96-103.

² s. 16. Under this power a high court was established at Allahabad in 1866. It is probable that the power was thereby exhausted.

³ 28 & 29 Vict. c. 15. Digest, s. 104.

⁴ 28 & 29 Vict. c. 17.

⁶ Ibid. 57.

⁵ See Digest, s. 63.

⁷ 32 & 33 Vict. c. 97.

from a tenure during good behaviour to a term of ten years. It also transferred to the Crown from the Secretary of State in Council the right of filling vacancies in the offices of the members of the councils in India.

The Indian Councils Act, 1869¹, still further extended the legislative powers of the governor-general's council by enabling it to make laws for all native Indian subjects of Her Majesty in any part of the world, whether in India or not.

A very important modification in the machinery for Indian legislature was made by the Government of India Act, 1870². It has been seen that for a long time the governor-general believed himself to have the power of legislating by executive order for the non-regulation provinces. The Indian Councils Act of 1861, whilst validating rules made under this power in the past, took away the power for the future. The Act of 1870 practically restored this power by enabling the governor-general to legislate in a summary manner for the less advanced parts of India³. The machinery provided is as follows. The Secretary of State in Council, by resolution, declares the provisions of section 1 of the Act of 1870 applicable to some particular part of a British Indian province. Thereupon the Governor in Council, lieutenant-governor, or chief commissioner of the province, may at any time propose to the Governor-General in Council drafts of regulations for the peace and good government of that part, and these drafts, when approved and assented to by the Governor-General in Council, and duly gazetted, have the same force of law as if they had been formally passed at sittings of the Legislative Council. This machinery has been extensively applied to the less advanced districts of the different Indian provinces, and numerous regulations have been, and are constantly being, made under it.

¹ 32 & 33 Vict. c. 98. See Digest, s. 63.

² 33 & 34 Vict. c. 3. Digest, s. 68.

³ This restoration of a power of summary legislation was strongly advocated by Sir H. S. Maine. See Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, pp. 153, 156.

The same Act of 1870 contained two other provisions of considerable importance. One of them (s. 5) repeated and strengthened the power of the governor-general to overrule his council¹. The other (s. 6), after reciting the expediency of giving additional facilities for the employment of natives of India 'of proved merit and ability' in the civil service of Her Majesty in India, enabled any native of India to be appointed to any 'office, place, or employment' in that service, notwithstanding that he had not been admitted to that service in the manner directed by the Act of 1858, i.e. by competition in England. The conditions of such appointments were to be regulated by rules made by the Governor-General in Council, with the approval of the Secretary of State in Council². The result of these rules was the 'statutory civilian,' who has now been merged in or superseded by the 'Provincial Service.'

Two small Acts were passed in 1871, the Indian Councils Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 34)³, which made slight extensions of the powers of local legislatures, and the Indian Bishops Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 62), which regulated the leave of absence of Indian bishops.

An Act of 1873 (36 Vict. c. 17) formally dissolved the East India Company as from January 1, 1874.

The Indian Councils Act, 1874 (37 & 38 Vict. c. 91), enabled a sixth member of the governor-general's council to be appointed for public works purposes.

The Council of India Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 7), enabled the Secretary of State, for special reasons, to appoint any person having professional or other peculiar qualifications to be a member of the Council of India, with the old tenure, 'during good behaviour,' which had been abolished in 1869⁴.

¹ See Digest, s. 44. It will be remembered that Lord Lytton acted under this power when he exempted imported cotton goods from duty in 1879.

² See *ibid.* 94.

³ This Act was passed in consequence of the decision of the Bombay High Court in *R. v. Reay*, 7 Bom. Cr. 6. See note on s. 79 of Digest.

⁴ This power was exercised in the case of Sir H. S. Maine, and was probably conferred with special reference to him.

TABLE OF DATES

GENERAL HISTORY.

INDIA.

- 1453 (May 29). Constantinople taken by the Turks.
1486. Cape of Good Hope discovered by Bartholomew Diaz.
1493. Pope Alexander the Sixth's Bull.
- 1497-8. Voyage of Vasco da Gama to India.
- 1535-6 (February). Grant of 'Capitulations' by Solyman the Magnificent to Francis I.
- 1558-1603. Elizabeth.
1572. Massacre of Huguenots.
- 1577-80. Drake's voyage round the world.
1579. Capitulations granted to England.
1580. Spain annexes Portugal.
1581. Charter granted to Levant Company.
1588. Defeat of the Spanish Armada. Levant Company incorporated.
1589. Henry IV of France.
1598. Edict of Nantes.
1599. Death of Philip II of Spain.
1603. James I.
1606. First Charter of Virginia Company.
1609. Second Charter of Virginia Company.
- Henry IV of France murdered by Ravalliac.
1618. Beginning of Thirty Years' War.

- 1556 1605. Akbar.
1565. Fall of Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar.
1579. Thomas Stevens visits Goa.
1589. An English expedition reaches India by land.
1600. East India Company founded.
1602. Dutch East India Company founded.
1604. French East India Company founded.
- 1605-27. Jehangir.
1609. Charter of East India Company renewed.
1611. English at Masulipatam.
1612. English at Surat.
1615. Sir Thomas Roesent as Envoy to Great Mogul.
- Authority to execute martial law granted to East India Company.
1616. Tranquebar granted to the Danes.
1620. English agents in Bengal.
- 1622-3 (February). Massacre of Amboyna.

or alter Acts of the governor-general's council affecting their province ¹.

The Madras and Bombay Armies Act, 1893 (56 & 57 Vict. c. 62), abolished the offices of commanders-in-chief of the Madras and Bombay armies, and thus made possible a simplification of the Indian military system which had been asked for persistently by four successive viceroys ².

The Contracts (India Office) Act, 1903 (3 Edw. VII, c. 11), declared the mode in which certain contracts might be made by the Secretary of State in Council ³.

The Indian Councils Act, 1904 (4 Edw. VII, c. 26), while continuing the power to appoint a sixth member of the Governor-General's Council, removed the necessity for appointing him specifically for public works purposes ⁴.

¹ See Digest, s. 76. In the absence of this power the sphere of action of the new legislature for the North-Western Provinces and Oudh was confined within an infinitesimal area.

² Administrative reforms in India are not carried out with undue precipitancy. The appointment of a single commander-in-chief for India, with four subordinate commanders under him, was recommended by Lord William Bentinck, Sir Charles Metcalfe, and others in 1833. (Further Papers respecting the East India Company's Charter, 1833.)

³ See Digest, s. 32.

⁴ See Digest, s. 39.

[The authorities which I have found most useful for this chapter are, Reports of Parliamentary Committees *passim*; Calendar of State Papers. Colonial. East Indies; Shaw, *Charters of the East India Company*, Madras, 1887; Birdwood, *Report on the Old Records of the India Office*, 2nd reprint, 1891; Morley's *Digest*, Introduction; Stephen (J. F.), *Nuncomar and Impey*, 1885; Forrest (G.), *Selections from State Papers, India, 1772-85*; and, for general history, Hunter (Sir W. W.), *History of British India* (only 2 vols. published); Lyall (Sir A. C.), *British Dominion in India*; Lecky, *History of England in the 18th century*; Hunt (W.), *Political History of England, 1760-1801*; and Mill's *History of British India*, with its continuation by Wilson.]

for and in the name of the King, and to be applied and disposed of exclusively for the purposes of the Government of India ¹. The expenditure of these revenues, both in India and elsewhere, is declared to be subject to the control of the Secretary of State in Council, and no grant or appropriation of any part of the revenues is to be made without the concurrence of a majority of the votes at a meeting of the Council of India ². Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of His Majesty's Indian possessions, or under other sudden and urgent necessity, the revenues of India are not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, to be applicable to defraying the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of those possessions by His Majesty's forces charged upon those revenues ³.

The accounts of the Indian revenues and expenditure are Audit-laid annually before Parliament, and the accounts of the Secretary of State in Council are audited by an auditor, who is appointed by the King by warrant countersigned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer ⁴.

For the purpose of legal proceedings and contracts, but ^{Contracts} not for the purpose of holding property, the Secretary of ^{and legal} State in Council is a juristic person or body corporate by ^{proceed} ^{ings} that name, having the same capacities and liabilities as the East India Company ⁵. He has also statutory powers of contracting through certain officers in India ⁶.

At the head of the Government in India is the governor- ^{Govern-} general, who is also viceroy, or representative of the King. ^{ment in} He is appointed by the King by warrant under his sign ^{India.} manual, and usually holds office for a term of five years ^{The} ^{governor-} ^{general} ⁷.

He has a council, which at present consists of six members, ^{The} besides the commander-in-chief, who may be, and in practice ^{governor-} ^{general's} ^{council} always is, appointed an extraordinary member ⁸.

¹ Digest, s. 22.

² Ibid. 23. See, however, the practical qualifications of this requirement noted above.

³ Ibid. 24.

⁴ Ibid. 33.

⁵ Ibid. 29, 30.

⁷ Ibid. 36, 37.

⁶ Ibid. 32, 35.

⁸ Ibid. 38, 40.

But these rules, forms, and tables are to be subject to the previous approval of the Government of India or of the local government¹.

The business of the chartered high courts is distributed among single judges and division courts in accordance with rules of court, subject to any provision which may be made by Act of the Governor-General in Council².

The Governor-General in Council may by order alter the local limits of the jurisdiction of the several chartered high courts, and authorize them to exercise jurisdiction over Christian subjects of His Majesty resident in Native States³.

The old enactments requiring the chartered high courts, in the exercise of their original jurisdiction with reference to certain matters of which the most important are inheritance and succession, when both parties are subject to the same law or custom, to decide according to that law or custom, and when they are subject to different laws or customs, to decide according to the law of the defendant, are still in force, subject to such modifications as have been or may be made by Indian legislation⁴.

Traces of the old conflicts between the supreme court and the governor-general's council are still to be found in enactments which exempt the governor-general and the governors of Madras and Bombay and members of their council from the original jurisdiction of the chartered high courts in respect of anything counselled, ordered, or done by any of them in their public capacity, from liability to arrest or imprisonment in any civil proceeding in a high court, and from being subject to the criminal jurisdiction of a high court in respect of any misdemeanour at common law or under any Act of Parliament⁵. Nor are the chartered high courts to exercise original jurisdiction in revenue matters⁶.

Jurisdiction of English

The highest officials in India are exempted from the jurisdiction of the Indian chartered high courts, but under enact-

¹ Digest, s. 102.

² Ibid. 108.

³ Ibid. 103.

⁴ Ibid. 105.

⁵ Ibid. 104.

⁶ Ibid. 101.

The Governor of Madras or Bombay is also an extraordinary member of the council whenever it sits within his province (which, in fact, never happens ¹).

The power given by an Act of 1874 to appoint a sixth ordinary member specifically for public works purposes was made general by an Act of 1904.

The ordinary members of the governor-general's council are appointed by the Crown, in practice for a term of five years. Three of them must be persons who, at the time of their appointment, have been for at least ten years in the service of the Crown in India, and one must be a barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates of Scotland, of not less than five years' standing ².

If there is a difference of opinion in the council, in ordinary circumstances the opinion of the majority prevails, but, in exceptional circumstances, the governor-general has power to overrule his council ³.

If the governor-general visits any part of India unaccompanied by his council, he is empowered to appoint some ordinary member of his council to be president of the council in his place, and, in such case, there is further power to make an order authorizing the governor-general alone to exercise all the executive powers of the Governor-General in Council ⁴.

The official acts of the central Government in India are expressed to run in the name of the Governor-General in Council, often described as the Government of India ⁵. The executive work of the Government of India is distributed among departments which may be compared to the departments of the central Government in England. There are at present nine of these departments—Finance, Foreign, Home, Legislative, Revenue and Agriculture, Public Works, Commerce and Industry, Army, and Military Supply. At the head of each of them is one of the secretaries to the

¹ Digest, s. 40.

² Ibid. 39.

³ Ibid. 44.

⁴ Ibid. 45, 47.

⁵ Legislative sanction for this name is given by the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (22)).

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1858 (February 25). Lord Derby, Prime Minister.	1858. Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Viet. c. 106), places British India under direct government of Crown.—Lord Canning, Viceroy. (November 1.) Queen's Amnesty Proclamation published in India.
1859. Italian War.—Battles of Magenta and Solferino. (June 18.) Lord Palmerston, Prime Minister.	1859. Punjab constituted a Lieutenant-Governorship under Sir John Lawrence. Indian Code of Civil Procedure passed.
	1860. Indian Penal Code passed.
	1861. Indian Civil Service Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Viet. c. 54), Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Viet. c. 67), and Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Viet. c. 104), passed by Parliament. —Code of Criminal Procedure passed in India.
	1862-3. Lord Elgin, Viceroy.
	1864-5. Lord Lawrence, Viceroy.
	1864. Bhutân Dwarâs annexed.
1865 (November 6). Lord Russell becomes Prime Minister on death of Lord Palmerston.	1865. Indian Succession Act passed.
1866. War between Prussia and Austria.—Battle of Königgrätz or Sadowa.	1866. Famine in Orissa.
(July 6.) Lord Derby, Prime Minister.	1867 (September). Straits Settlements separated from India.
1868 (February 27). B. Disraeli, Prime Minister.	1868. Sher Ali, Amir of Afghanistan.
Abyssinian expedition.	
(December 9.) W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.	
1869 (November). Suez Canal opened.	1869-72. Lord Mayo, Viceroy.
1870. Franco-German War.—Revolution in France.	1869. Legislative Department of Government of India established.
1871. King William of Prussia becomes German Emperor.	1872. Indian Contract Act and Evidence Act passed.
1874 (February 21). B. Disraeli, Prime Minister.	1872-3. Lord Northbrook, Viceroy.
	1873-80. Lord Lytton, Viceroy.
	1876-8. Famine in India.

Government of India, who corresponds to the permanent secretary in England, and each of them, except the Foreign Department, is assigned to the special care of one of the members of council. The Foreign Department is under the immediate superintendence of the viceroy, who may be thus called his own Foreign Minister, although members of the council share responsibility for such matters relating to the department as come within their cognizance.

Besides these nine departments of the Secretariat, there are special departments, outside the Secretariat departments but attached to some one of them. These special departments either transact branches of work which the Government of India keeps in its own hands, or exercise supervision over branches of work which are conducted by the Local Governments. Thus the Directors-General of the Post Office and of the Telegraph department, the Surveyor-General, and the newly constituted Railway Board, are at the head of departments which are centrally administered. On the other hand the Inspectors-General of Forests and of Agriculture, and the Directors-General of Education and of the Indian Medical Service, represent departments which are administered by the Local Governments but supervised by the Government of India.

In the transaction of business, minor questions are settled departmentally. Questions involving a difference of opinion between two departments, or raising any grave issue, are brought up to be settled in council.

The council usually meets once a week, but special meetings may be summoned at any time. The meetings are private, and the procedure is of the same informal kind as at a meeting of the English Cabinet, the chief difference being that one of the secretaries to the Government usually attends during the discussion of any question affecting his department, and takes a note of the order passed ¹.

¹ For a description of the mode of transacting business in council before the work of the Government was 'departmentalized,' see *Lord Minto in India*, p. 26, and as to the effect of departmentalizing, see Strachey, p. 60.

Every dispatch from the Secretary of State is circulated among all the members of the council, and every dispatch to the Secretary of State is signed by every member of the council who is present at headquarters, as well as by the viceroy, unless he is absent.

If any member of the council dissents from any dispatch signed by his colleagues, he has the right to append to it a minute of dissent.

The headquarters of the Government of India are at Calcutta during the cold weather season, and at Simla during the rest of the year ¹.

The local
govern-
ments.

For purposes of administration British India is now divided into thirteen provinces, each with its own local government. These provinces are the old presidencies ² of Madras (Fort St. George) and Bombay; five Lieutenant-Governorships, namely, Bengal, Eastern Bengal and Assam ³, the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh ⁴, the Punjab, and Burma ⁵; and six Chief Commissionerships, namely, the Central Provinces, Ajmere-Merwara, Coorg, British Baluchistan ⁶, the North-West Frontier Province ⁷, and the Andaman Islands.

The provinces of Madras and Bombay are each under a governor and council appointed by the Crown, in practice for a term of five years, the governor being usually an English statesman, and the council consisting of two members of the Indian Civil Service of twelve years' standing ⁸. The governors of Madras and Bombay retain their privilege of

¹ As to the advantages and disadvantages of Simla as a seat of Government, see Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 70.

² As to the ambiguity of the term 'presidency,' see Chesney, *Indian Policy* (3rd ed.), pp. 79, 88. Strachey, p. 43.

³ Constituted in 1905 by the union of the Eastern part of Bengal with the Chief Commissionership of Assam. See Act VII of 1905.

⁴ Constituted in 1901 by the union of the Lieutenant-Governorship of the North-Western Provinces with the Chief Commissionership of Oudh.

⁵ Placed under a lieutenant-governor in 1897.

⁶ Made a Chief Commissionership in 1887.

⁷ Carved out of the Punjab, and placed under a Chief Commissioner in 1901.

⁸ Digest, ss. 50, 51.

communicating directly with the Secretary of State, and have the same power as the governor-general of overruling their councils in cases of emergency. For reasons which are mainly historical, the control of the Government of India over the Governments of Madras and Bombay is less complete than over other local Governments.

The lieutenant-governors have no executive councils, and are appointed by the governor-general, with the approval of the King¹. They are in practice appointed from the Indian Civil Service², and hold office for five years.

The chief commissioners are appointed by the Governor-General in Council. In some cases this office is combined with another post. Thus the Resident at Mysore is, *ex-officio*, Chief Commissioner of Coorg, and the Governor-General's Agent for Rajputana is, *ex-officio*, Chief Commissioner of Ajmere-Merwara. So also the Chief Commissioners of British Baluchistan and of the North-West Frontier Province are Governor-General's Agents for dealing with the neighbouring tribes outside British India.

Under an arrangement made in 1902 the 'Assigned Districts' of Berar are leased in perpetuity to the British Government, and are administered by the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces.

For legislative purposes the governor-general's council is expanded into a legislative council by the addition of not less than ten nor more than sixteen additional members, of whom at least one-half must be persons not in the civil or military service of the Crown in India. These additional members are nominated by the governor-general under rules approved by the Secretary of State³. Under the rules framed in pursuance of the Act of 1892⁴ there are sixteen additional members, of whom six are officials appointed by the Governor-General in Council, and ten are non-official.

¹ Digest, s. 55.

² There may have been exceptions, e. g. Sir H. Durand.

³ Digest, s. 60.

⁴ 55 & 56 Vict. c. 14.

Of the non-official members four are appointed by the governor-general on the recommendation of the non-official additional members of the provincial legislatures of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, and the United Provinces, each of these bodies recommending one member, and one on the recommendation of the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce. The governor-general can, if he thinks fit, decline to accept a recommendation thus made, and in that case a fresh recommendation is submitted to him. The remaining five members are nominated by the governor-general, 'in such manner as shall appear to him most suitable with reference to the legislative business to be brought before the council, and the due representation of the different classes of the community.'

The additional members hold office for two years, and are entitled to be present at all legislative meetings of the council, but at no others ¹.

The legislature thus formed bears the awkward name of 'the Governor-General in Council at meetings for the purpose of making laws and regulations.'

The Governor-General in Council at these meetings has power to make laws—

- (a) for all persons, for all courts, and for all places and things within British India; and
- (b) for all British subjects of His Majesty and servants of the Government of India within other parts of India, that is to say, within the Native States; and
- (c) for all persons being native Indian subjects of His Majesty, or native Indian officers or soldiers in His Majesty's Indian forces when in any part of the world, whether within or without His Majesty's dominions; and
- (d) for all persons employed or serving in the Indian Marine Service ².

¹ Digest, s. 60.

² Ibid. 63. As to whether there is any power to legislate for servants of the Government outside 'India,' see the note (c) on that section.

But this power is subject to various restrictions. For instance, it does not extend to the alteration of any Act of Parliament passed since 1860, or of certain specified portions of earlier Acts¹, and does not enable the legislature to make any law affecting the authority of Parliament or any part of the unwritten laws or constitution of the United Kingdom whereon may depend the allegiance of any person to the Crown or the sovereignty or dominion of the Crown in any part of British India².

Measures affecting the public debt or revenues of India, the religion or religious rites or usages of any class of His Majesty's subjects in India, the discipline or maintenance of the military or naval forces, or the relations of the Government with foreign States, cannot be introduced by any member without the previous sanction of the governor-general³. Every Act requires the governor-general's assent, unless it is reserved by him for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure, in which case the power of assenting rests with the Crown. The assent of the Crown is in other cases not necessary to the validity of an Act, but any Act may be disallowed by the Crown⁴.

The procedure at meetings of the Legislative Council is regulated by rules made by the council and assented to by the governor-general⁵.

Under the Act of 1861, the powers of the Legislative Council were strictly confined to the consideration of measures introduced into the council for the purpose of enactment or the alteration of rules for the conduct of business⁶. But under the Act of 1892 rules may be made authorizing at meetings of the Council discussion of the annual financial statement and the asking of questions, but under such conditions and restrictions, as to subject or otherwise, as may be prescribed.

¹ Namely, 3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85, except ss. 81-86; 16 & 17 Vict. c. 95; 17 & 18 Vict. c. 77; 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106; 22 & 23 Vict. c. 41. See 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 22, as amended by 32 & 33 Vict. c. 98, s. 2.

² Digest, s. 63.

³ Ibid. 64.

⁴ Ibid. 65, 66.

⁵ Ibid. 67.

⁶ See above, p. 100.

Under the rules made in pursuance of this power the annual financial statement must be made publicly in the council. Every member is at liberty to make any observations he thinks fit, and the financial member of the council and the president have the right of reply. Under the same rules due notice must be given of any question, and every question must be a request for information only, and must not be put in argumentative, or hypothetical, or defamatory language. No discussion is permitted in respect of an answer given on behalf of the Government, and the president may disallow any question which, in his opinion, cannot be answered consistently with the public interest.

Besides the formal power of making laws through the Legislative Council, the governor-general has also, under an Act of 1870¹, power to legislate in a more summary manner, by means of regulations, for the government of certain districts of India of a more backward character, which are defined by orders of the Secretary of State, and which are 'scheduled districts' within the meaning of certain Acts of the Indian Legislature. Under a section of the Act of 1861² the governor-general has also power, in cases of emergency, to make temporary ordinances which are to be in force for a term not exceeding six months.

The Governor-General in Council also exercises certain legislative powers with respect to Native States, but in his executive capacity, and not through his legislative council³.

Local legislatures were established by the Indian Councils Act, 1861, for the provinces of Madras and Bombay, and have, under the powers given by that Act, since been established for Bengal, for the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh as constituting a single province, for the Punjab, for Burma, and for the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam⁴.

The legislatures for Madras and Bombay consist of the

¹ 33 Vict. c. 3, s. 1, above, p. 105. Digest, s. 68.

² 24 & 25 Vict. c. 67, s. 23. Digest, s. 69.

³ See Chapter v.

⁴ See Digest, ss. 70, 74.

governor and his council, reinforced, for the purpose of legislation, by additional members. These additional members must be not less than eight and not more than twenty in number, and must include the advocate-general of the province, and at least one-half of them must be persons not in the civil or military service of the Crown. They are nominated by the governor in accordance with rules framed by the Governor-General in Council and approved by the Secretary of State. Under the existing rules, their number, both at Madras and at Bombay, is fixed at twenty, of whom not more than nine may be officials. The system of nomination adopted is intended to give a representative character to the members. For instance, at Bombay eight non-official members are nominated on the recommendation of various bodies and associations, including one recommended by the Corporation of the City, one by the University, and six by groups of municipal corporations, groups of district local boards, classes of large landholders, and associations of merchants, manufacturers, or tradesmen. The remaining non-official members are nominated by the governor 'in such manner as shall in his opinion secure a fair representation of the different classes of the community.'

In the provinces which have legislative, but not executive, councils, the legislature consists of the lieutenant-governor and of persons nominated by him under similar rules and on the same general principles as those which apply to the local legislatures of Madras and Bombay. The number of the nominated members of the legislative council is twenty in Bengal, fifteen in the United Provinces, nine in the Punjab and Burma respectively, and fifteen in Eastern Bengal and Assam. One-third of them must be persons not in the civil or military service of the Crown¹. Of the fifteen councillors for Eastern Bengal and Assam not more than seven may be officials².

The powers of the local legislatures are more limited than

¹ Digest, s. 73.

² See notification of Oct. 16, 1905.

those of the legislative council of the governor-general. They cannot make any law affecting any Act of Parliament for the time being in force in the province, and may not, without the previous sanction of the governor-general, make or take into consideration any law—

- (a) affecting the public debt of India, or the customs duties, or any other tax or duty for the time being in force and imposed by the authority of the Governor-General in Council for the general purposes of the Government of India ; or
- (b) regulating any of the current coin, or the issuing of any bills, notes, or other paper currency ; or
- (c) regulating the conveyance of letters by the post office or messages by the electric telegraph within the province ; or
- (d) altering the Indian Penal Code ; or
- (e) affecting the religion or religious rites or usages of any class of His Majesty's subjects in India ; or
- (f) affecting the discipline or maintenance of any part of His Majesty's naval or military forces ; or
- (g) regulating patents or copyright ; or
- (h) affecting the relations of the Government with foreign princes or States ¹.

Until 1892 their powers were much restricted by their inability to alter any Act of the Governor-General in Council, but under a provision of the Indian Councils Act, 1892, the local legislature of any province may, with the previous sanction of the governor-general, repeal or amend as to that province any law or regulation made by any other authority in India ².

Acts passed by a local legislature in India require the assent of the governor-general, and are subject to disallowance by the Crown in the same manner as Acts of the governor-general's legislative council ². The restrictions on

¹ Digest, s. 76.

² Ibid. 78.

British legislatures with limited powers, has power to make laws on particular subjects with more extensive operation than laws made under its ordinary powers. See e.g. the Extradition Act, 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 52, s. 18), the Slave Trade Act, 1876 (39 & 40 Vict. c. 46, s. 2), the Fugitive Offenders Act, 1881 (44 & 45 Vict. c. 69, s. 32), the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 27), the Colonial Probates Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 6, s. 1), and the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict. c. 60, ss. 264, 368, 735, 736).

The leading case on the general powers of the Indian Legislature is *The Queen v. Burah* (1878), L. R. 3 App. Cas. 889. The Indian Legislature had passed an Act (XXII of 1869) purporting:—First, to remove the Garo Hills from the jurisdiction of the ordinary civil and criminal courts, and from the law applicable to those courts, and, secondly, to vest the administration of civil and criminal justice in those territories in officers appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The Act was to come into operation on a date to be fixed by the lieutenant-governor. By the ninth section the lieutenant-governor was empowered, by notification in the Calcutta Gazette, to extend all or any of the provisions of the Act to certain neighbouring mountainous districts. The validity of the Act, and particularly of the ninth section, was questioned, but was maintained by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, who held (1) that the Act was not inconsistent with the Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), or with the Charter of the Calcutta High Court; (2) that it was in its general scope within the legislative powers of the Governor-General in Council; (3) that the ninth section was conditional legislation and not a delegation of legislative power, and (4) that where plenary powers of legislation exist as to particular subjects, whether in an imperial or in a provincial legislature, they may be well exercised, either absolutely or conditionally; in the latter case leaving to some external authority the time and manner of carrying its legislation into effect, and the area over which it is to extend.

Lord Selborne, in delivering the judgement of the Judicial Committee, expressed himself as follows:—

‘The Indian Legislature has powers expressly limited by the Act of the Imperial Parliament which created it, and it can, of course, do nothing beyond the limits which circumscribe these powers. But, when acting within these limits, it is not in any sense an agent or delegate of the Imperial Parliament, but has, and was intended to have, plenary powers of legislation, as large, and of the same nature, as those of Parliament itself. The established courts of justice, when a question arises whether the prescribed limits have been exceeded, must of necessity determine that question; and the only way in which they can properly do so is by looking to the terms of the instrument, by which affirmatively the legislative powers were created, and by which negatively they are restricted. If what has been done is legislation within the general scope of the affirmative words which give the power, and if it violates no express condition or restriction by which

that power is limited (in which category would of course be included any Act of the Imperial Parliament at variance with it), it is not for any court of justice to inquire further, or to enlarge constructively those conditions and restrictions.¹

The same principles have been since laid down with respect to colonial legislatures in the case of *Powell v. Apollo Candle Company* (1885), 10 App. Cas. 282. See also *Harris v. Davies* (1885), 10 App. Cas. 279, and *Musgrove v. Chun Teecong Toy*, [1891] L. R. A. C. 274 (the Chinese immigration case).

In *Sprigg v. Sigan*, [1897] A. C. 238, it was held on appeal from the Cape that a power for the governor to add to the existing laws already proclaimed and in force in Pondoland such laws as he should from time to time by proclamation declare to be in force in those territories, did not authorize the issue of a proclamation for the arrest and imprisonment of a particular chief.

(b) The expression used in the Indian Councils Act, 1861, is 'the Indian territories *now* under the dominion of Her Majesty.' But s. 3 of the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14), explains that this is to be read as if the words 'or hereafter' were inserted after 'now.' Consequently it is represented by British India, which means the territories for the time being constituting British India (see s. 124 and the notes thereon).

(c) The Act of 1861 gave power to make laws 'for all servants of the Government of India within the dominions of princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty.' The Act of 1865 gave power to make laws 'for all British subjects of Her Majesty within the dominions of princes or States *in India* in alliance with Her Majesty, whether in the service of the Government of India or not.' Consequently it may be argued that the power to make laws for servants of the Government of India, as distinguished from British subjects generally, extends beyond the Native States of India. But, having regard to the sense in which the phrase 'princes and States in alliance with Her Majesty' is commonly used in Acts relating to India, it seems safer to adopt the narrower construction and to treat the expressions in the Act of 1861 and in the Act of 1865 as synonymous¹.

The expression 'Government of India' is defined by the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897), in terms which would exclude the local Governments. But this definition does not apply to the construction of an English Act of Parliament, and the expression 'servants of the Government of India' in the Act of 1861 would doubtless be held to include all servants of the Crown employed by or under the Government of India, whether directly employed by the Government of India in its narrower sense, or by or under a local Government, and

¹ On general principles, there would seem to be no objection to legislation conferring jurisdiction in respect of an offence committed by a servant of the Crown in any foreign country, where the offence consists of a *breach of his duty to the Crown*.

TABLE OF DATES

xxvii

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1877. Russo-Turkish War.	1877 (January 1). Queen proclaimed Empress of India at Delhi.
1878. Treaties of San Stefano (March) and Berlin (July).	1878. Invasion of Afghanistan. 1879 (July). Treaty of Gandamak. (September.) Cavagnari killed at Cabul.—English invade Afghanistan.
1880 (April 25). W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.	1880-4. Lord Ripon, Viceroy.
1882. Indian troops used in the Egyptian War.	1880 (July). Abdurrahman recognized as Amir of Afghanistan.—Battle of Maiwand. General Roberts' march from Cabul to Kandahar.
1885 (June 24). Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister.	1884. Boundary Commission appointed to settle North-West frontier.
1886 (February 6). W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister. (August 3.) Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister.	1884-8. Lord Dufferin, Viceroy.
1887. Jubilee of Queen Victoria's reign.	1885. Third Burmese War.
1892 (August 18). W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.	1886 (January 1). Upper Burma annexed. (November 21.) Legislative Council established for North-Western Provinces.
1894 (March 3). Lord Rosebery, Prime Minister.	1888-93. Lord Lansdowne, Viceroy.
1895 (July 2). Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister.	1889. Military expeditions sent against hill tribes.
	1890. Chin and Lushai expeditions.—Rising in Manipur.
	1891. Massacre in Manipur.
	1892. Constitution and procedure of Indian Legislative Councils altered by Indian Councils Act, 1892 (55 & 56 Vict. c. 14).
	1893. Separate armies of Madras and Bombay abolished by Madras and Bombay Armies Act, 1893 (56 & 57 Vict. c. 62).
	(June 26.) Indian Mint closed.
	1894 (January 27). Lord Elgin, Viceroy.
	(December 27.) Import duty imposed on cotton.
	1895. Chitral Expedition.
	1896. Appearance of plague in Bombay.

- (10) Rules, laws, and regulations made by the governor-general or the Governor-General in Council for non-regulation provinces before 1861, and confirmed by s. 25 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861¹.

These enactments are supplemented by such portions of the Hindu, Mahomedan, and other native laws and customs as are still in force, and by such rules or principles of European, mainly English, law as have been applied to the country, either under the direction to act in accordance with justice, equity, and good conscience, or in other ways, and as have not been superseded by Indian codification.

Native law has been wholly superseded, as to criminal law and procedure and as to civil procedure, by the Indian Penal Code, the Indian Codes of Criminal and Civil Procedure, the Evidence Act, and other enactments, and has been largely superseded as to other matters by Anglo-Indian legislation, but still regulates, as personal law, most matters relating to family law and to the law of succession and inheritance among Hindus, Mahomedans, and other natives of the country².

The East India Company Act, 1793 (33 Geo. III, c. 52), reserved to members of the covenanted civil service³ the principal civil offices in India under the rank of member of council. Appointments to this service were made in England by the Court of Directors.

The civil service of India.

The Government of India Act, 1853 (16 & 17 Vict. c. 95), threw these appointments open to competition among natural-born subjects of Her Majesty, and this system was maintained by the Act of 1858, which transferred the government of India to the Crown⁴. The first regulations for the competi-

¹ See above, p. 102. Probably most, if not all, of this body of laws has expired or been superseded.

² See below, Chapter iv.

³ So called from the covenants into which the superior servants of the East India Company were required to enter, and by which they were bound not to trade, not to receive presents, to subscribe for pensions, and so forth. Members of the civil service of India are still required to enter into similar covenants before receiving their appointments.

⁴ See Digest, s. 92.

the subjects of discussion at that council also apply to meetings of the local legislatures¹.

No precise line of demarcation is drawn between the subjects which are reserved to the control of the local legislatures respectively². In practice, however, the governor-general's council confines itself to legislation which is either for provinces having no local legislatures of their own, or on matters which are beyond the competency of the local legislatures, or on branches of the law which require to be dealt with on uniform principles throughout British India. Under this last head fall the so-called Indian codes, including the Penal Code, the Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedure, the Succession Act, the Evidence Act, the Contract Act, the Specific Relief Act, the Negotiable Instruments Act, the Transfer of Property Act, the Trusts Act, and the Easements Act.

The law administered by the courts of British India consists, Indian Law.
so far as it is enacted law, of—

- (1) Such Acts of Parliament as extend, expressly or by implication, to British India³.
- (2) The regulations made by the Governments of Madras, Bengal, and Bombay before the coming into operation of the Government of India Act, 1833 (3 & 4 Will. IV, c. 85)⁴.

¹ Digest, s. 77.

² As to the relations between the governor-general's council and local legislatures, see Minutes by Sir H. S. Maine, No. 69.

³ See the Statutes relating to India, published by the Indian Legislative Department in 1899.

⁴ The Bengal Regulations passed before 1793 were in that year collected and passed by Lord Cornwallis in the shape of a revised code. 675 Regulations were passed between 1793 and 1834, both inclusive, but of these only eighty-nine are now wholly or partly in force. Such of them as are still in force are to be found in the volumes of the Bengal Code published by the Indian Legislative Department.

Of the 251 Madras Regulations, twenty-eight are still wholly or partly in force, and are to be found in the Madras Code.

The Bombay Regulations were revised and consolidated by Mountstuart Elphinstone in 1827. Twenty Bombay Regulations are still wholly or partly in force, and are to be found in the Bombay Code.

- (3) The Acts passed by the Governor-General in Council under the Government of India Act, 1833, and subsequent statutes ¹.
- (4) The Acts passed by the local legislatures of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the North-Western Provinces and Oudh (now the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh), the Punjab, Burma and Eastern Bengal and Assam, since their constitution under the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67) ².
- (5) The Regulations made by the governor-general under the Government of India Act, 1870 (33 Vict. c. 3) ³.
- (6) The Ordinances, if any, made by the governor-general under s. 23 of the Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), and for the time being in force ⁴.

To these may be added—

- (7) Orders in Council made by the King in Council and applying to India ⁵.
- (8) Statutory rules made under the authority of English Acts ⁶.
- (9) Rules, orders, regulations, by-laws, and notifications made under the authority of Indian Acts ⁷.

¹ Revised editions of these Acts, omitting repealed matter, have been published by the Indian Legislative Department. Such of them as relate only to particular provinces are to be found in the 'Codes' for these provinces published by the Legislative Department.

² These Acts are to be found in the volumes of 'Codes' mentioned above.

³ A Chronological Table of and Index to these five classes of enactments have been compiled by the Indian Legislative Departments.

⁴ See Digest, s. 69.

⁵ See e.g. the Order in Council confirming the Extradition (India) Act, 1895 (IX of 1895), *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*, v. 297; the Zanzibar Order in Council of 1897, which gives an appeal from the British Court in Zanzibar to the Bombay High Court, *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*, v. 87; and the Indian (Foreign Jurisdiction) Order in Council, 1902, printed below, p. 388.

⁶ e.g. the rules made under s. 8 of the Indian Councils Act, 1891 (Digest, s. 43), and under ss. 1 & 2 of the Indian Councils Act, 1892 (Digest, ss. 60, 64).

⁷ Lists of such of these as have been made under general Acts have been published by the Legislative Department. There are also some lists and collections of rules made under local Acts.

GENERAL HISTORY.

1683. Death of Colbert.
1685. James II.
Revocation of Edict of Nantes.
1688. Revolution in England.
1689. William III.
Peter the Great becomes Czar of Russia.
- 1689-97. War between England and France.
1694. Bank of England incorporated.
1697. Treaty of Ryswick.
1700. War between Sweden and Russia.
1702. Anne.
- 1702-13. War of Spanish Succession.
1707. Union of England and Scotland.
1713. Treaty of Utrecht.
1714. George I.
French occupy Mauritius.
1715. Rebellion in Scotland.

INDIA.

1683. Rising at Bombay quelled.
Charter giving powers of martial law and establishing Admiralty Courts.
1686. Calcutta founded.
Charter of James II to East India Company.
1687. East India Company's factory moved from Surat to Bombay.
English driven from Hugli, but allowed to return.
Charter establishing municipality at Madras.
- 1687-9. East India Company's war against Aurangzeb.
1691. 'New' or 'English' Company established.
- 1693 (October 7). Grant of new charter to old East India Company. (Supplemental charters November 11, 1693, and September 28, 1694.)
1696. East India Company build Fort William.
1698. Charter modifying voting powers and qualifications of East India Company.
Act (9 & 10 William III, c. 44) authorizing incorporation of 'General Society.'
(September 3.) Charter incorporating the General Society as a regulated company.
(September 5.) Charter incorporating the 'English Company.'
East India Company buy site of Calcutta (Aitchison's Treaties, i. 2).
1702. Indenture Tripartite amalgamating the Old Company and the English Company.
1707. Death of Aurangzeb.
1708. Lord Godolphin's award as to terms of amalgamation.
1709. Old Company's charters surrendered. The two companies united as the United East India Company.

scheme, the number of appointments made in England was in 1880 reduced by one-sixth. The persons appointed under the rules were often described as 'statutory civilians,' and about sixty natives of India had been so appointed when the system was changed in 1889. The rules did not work satisfactorily, and in 1886 a commission, under the presidency of Sir Charles Aitchison, was appointed by the Government of India with instructions 'to devise a scheme which might reasonably be hoped to possess the necessary elements of finality, and to do full justice to the claims of natives of India to higher employment in the public service.'

Under the scheme established in pursuance of the recommendations of Sir Charles Aitchison's commission a provincial civil service has been formed by the amalgamation of the higher appointments in what was previously known as the uncovenanted civil service with a certain number of appointments previously held by the covenanted civil service. The lower grade appointments of what had been the uncovenanted civil service are now styled the 'subordinate service.' There are thus three classes of the general civil service, (1) the Civil Service of India, (2) the Provincial Service, and (3) the Subordinate Service. The Civil Service of India is recruited by open competition in England. The other two services are recruited provincially and consist almost entirely of natives of the province. The provincial service is fed mainly by direct recruitment, but, in exceptional cases, by promotion from the subordinate service. In the executive branch the lowest grade in the provincial service is the deputy collector, the highest in the subordinate service is the tahsildar. Judicial officers of all grades belong to the provincial service¹.

Besides this general service, there are special services such as the education department, the public works department, the forest department, and the police department. Appointments to the highest posts in these departments are as a rule

¹ As to the proportion of Englishmen in the Indian Civil Service, see Strachey, *India*, p. 82.

made in England. The other posts are recruited provincially, and are, like posts in the general service, graded as belonging either to a provincial service, or to a subordinate service¹.

The
chartered
high
courts.

It is only with reference to the four chartered high courts that the judicial system of India is regulated by English statute. Under the Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63), a supreme court was established by charter for Calcutta, and similar courts were established for Madras in 1800 (39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79), and for Bombay in 1823 (4 Geo. IV, c. 71). The Act of 1781 (21 Geo. III, c. 70) recognized an appellate jurisdiction over the country courts established by the Company in the Presidency of Bengal².

The Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), amalgamated the supreme and sadr courts at the three presidency towns (that is to say, the courts exercising the jurisdiction of the Crown and the appellate and supervisional jurisdiction of the Company at those towns), by authorizing the establishment of chartered high courts inheriting the jurisdiction of both these courts. The charters now regulating these high courts were granted in December, 1865. The same Act authorized the establishment of a new high court, and accordingly a charter establishing the High Court at Allahabad was granted in 1866.

Each of the four chartered high courts consists of a chief justice, and of as many judges, not exceeding fifteen, as His Majesty may think fit to appoint³.

A judge of a chartered high court must be either—

- (a) a barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, of not less than five years' standing ; or
- (b) a member of the civil service of India of not less than ten years' standing, and having for at least three years served as, or exercised the powers of, a district judge ; or

¹ See East India (Progress and Condition) Decennial Report, 1904, pp. 58-60.

² See above, p. 57.

³ Digest, s. 96.

- (c) a person having held judicial office not inferior to that of a subordinate judge, or judge of a small cause court, for not less than five years ; or
- (d) a person having been a pleader of a high court for not less than ten years¹.

But not less than one-third of the judges, including the chief justice, must be barristers or advocates, and not less than one-third must be members of the civil service of India¹.

Every judge of a chartered high court holds office during His Majesty's pleasure², and his salary, furlough, and pension are regulated by order of the Secretary of State in Council³. Temporary vacancies may be filled by the Governor-General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta, and by the local government in other cases⁴.

The jurisdiction of the chartered high courts is regulated by their charters⁵, and includes the comprehensive jurisdiction formerly exercised by the supreme and *sadr* courts⁶. They are also expressly invested by statute (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 15) with administrative superintendence over the courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction, and are empowered to—

- (a) call for returns ;
- (b) direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such court to any other court of equal or superior jurisdiction ;
- (c) make general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of those courts ;
- (d) prescribe forms for proceedings in those courts, and for the mode of keeping book entries or accounts by the officers of the courts ; and
- (e) settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriffs, attorneys, clerks, and officers of the courts⁷.

¹ Digest, s. 96.

² Ibid. 97.

³ Ibid. 99.

⁴ Ibid. 100.

⁵ Printed in *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*, vol. vi.

⁶ Digest, s. 101.

⁷ Ibid. 102.

made in England. The other posts are recruited provincially, and are, like posts in the general service, graded as belonging either to a provincial service, or to a subordinate service¹.

The
chartered
high
courts.

It is only with reference to the four chartered high courts that the judicial system of India is regulated by English statute. Under the Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63), a supreme court was established by charter for Calcutta, and similar courts were established for Madras in 1800 (39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79), and for Bombay in 1823 (4 Geo. IV, c. 71). The Act of 1781 (21 Geo. III, c. 70) recognized an appellate jurisdiction over the country courts established by the Company in the Presidency of Bengal².

The Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Viet. c. 104), amalgamated the supreme and *sadr* courts at the three presidency towns (that is to say, the courts exercising the jurisdiction of the Crown and the appellate and supervisional jurisdiction of the Company at those towns), by authorizing the establishment of chartered high courts inheriting the jurisdiction of both these courts. The charters now regulating these high courts were granted in December, 1865. The same Act authorized the establishment of a new high court, and accordingly a charter establishing the High Court at Allahabad was granted in 1866.

Each of the four chartered high courts consists of a chief justice, and of as many judges, not exceeding fifteen, as His Majesty may think fit to appoint³.

A judge of a chartered high court must be either—

- (a) a barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, of not less than five years' standing; or
- (b) a member of the civil service of India of not less than ten years' standing, and having for at least three years served as, or exercised the powers of, a district judge; or

¹ See East India (Progress and Condition) Decennial Report, 1904, pp. 58-60.

² See above, p. 57.

³ Digest, s. 96.

- (c) a person having held judicial office not inferior to that of a subordinate judge, or judge of a small cause court, for not less than five years ; or
- (d) a person having been a pleader of a high court for not less than ten years¹.

But not less than one-third of the judges, including the chief justice, must be barristers or advocates, and not less than one-third must be members of the civil service of India¹.

Every judge of a chartered high court holds office during His Majesty's pleasure², and his salary, furlough, and pension are regulated by order of the Secretary of State in Council³. Temporary vacancies may be filled by the Governor-General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta, and by the local government in other cases⁴.

The jurisdiction of the chartered high courts is regulated by their charters⁵, and includes the comprehensive jurisdiction formerly exercised by the supreme and *sadr* courts⁶. They are also expressly invested by statute (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 15) with administrative superintendence over the courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction, and are empowered to—

- (a) call for returns ;
- (b) direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such court to any other court of equal or superior jurisdiction ;
- (c) make general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of those courts ;
- (d) prescribe forms for proceedings in those courts, and for the mode of keeping book entries or accounts by the officers of the courts ; and
- (e) settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriffs, attorneys, clerks, and officers of the courts⁷.

¹ Digest, s. 96.

² Ibid. 97.

³ Ibid. 99.

⁴ Ibid. 100.

⁵ Printed in *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*, vol. vi.

⁶ Digest, s. 101.

⁷ Ibid. 102.

ments which are still in force¹ certain offences by persons holding office under the Crown in India are expressly made punishable as misdemeanours by the High Court in England. ^{courts over offences in India.}

These offences are :—

- (1) Oppression of any of His Majesty's subjects ;
- (2) Wilful breach or neglect of the orders of the Secretary of State ;
- (3) Wilful breach of the trust and duty of office ;
- (4) Trading ; and
- (5) Receipt of presents.

Under an Act of 1797 (37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 28), any British subject² who, without the previous consent in writing of the Secretary of State in Council, or of the Governor-General in Council, or of a local Government, is concerned in any loan to a native prince, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

Any of these offences may be tried and punished in England, but the prosecution must be commenced within five years after the commission of the offence or the arrival in the United Kingdom of the person charged, whichever is later³.

Supreme authority over the army in India is vested by law in the Governor-General in Council⁴. Under the arrangements made in 1905 the commander-in-chief of His Majesty's Forces in India has charge of the Army Department, which to a certain extent corresponds to the War Office in England. Subject to the administrative control of the Governor-General in Council, the same commander-in-chief is also the chief executive officer of the army. Under the system in force before the changes introduced by the Act of 1893 he held special command of the troops in the Bengal Presidency, and exercised a general control over the armies of Madras and Bombay. Each of these armies had a local commander-in-chief, who might

The army
in India.

¹ Digest, s. 117.

² This probably means any European British subject. See Digest, s. 118.

³ This is the period fixed by 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7. But the period under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 141, is six years from the commission of the offence and a shorter period is fixed by the general Act, 56 & 57 Vict. c. 61. See Digest, s. 119.

⁴ See *ibid.* 36.

TABLE OF DATES

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
1897 (June). Jubilee celebrations in England.	1896-7. Famine in India.
	1897 (April 9). Legislative Council established for Punjab. Burma constituted a Lieutenant-Governorship, with a Legislative Council. (June 12.) Earthquake in Bengal. War on North-Western frontier.
1899 (October 11). Boer War commenced: ended May 31, 1902.	1898. Appearance of plague at Calcutta and in Madras. Famine Commission.
1901 (January 22). Death of Queen Victoria. (January 24.) Proclamation of King Edward VII.	1899 (January 6). Lord Curzon, Viceroy.
	1899-1900. Recurrence of famine in India.
1902 (August 9.) Coronation. (January 30). Anglo-Japanese Treaty signed. (July.) Mr. Balfour, Prime Minister.	1901 (October). Death of Amir Abdur Rahman of Afghanistan. Punitive operations against Mahsud Waziris.
1904 (February 8). Russo-Japanese War commenced: ended September 5, 1905; Peace Treaty signed at Portsmouth, U.S.A. Anglo-French Agreement signed.	(November.) Constitution of the North-West frontier Province under a Chief Commissioner.
1905 (August 12). Anglo-Japanese Treaty signed. (November.) Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Prime Minister.	1902. 'North-Western Provinces and Oudh' renamed 'United Provinces of Agra and Oudh.'
	1902-3. Indian Police Commission.
	1903 (January). Delhi Durbar. (October.) Incorporation of Berar with the Central Provinces.
	1903-4. Mission to Tibet.
	1904. Indian Universities Act.
	1904-5. Mission to Cabul.
	1905 (March). Constitution of Railway Board in India.
	(April 4.) Earthquake in Punjab. Reorganization of Military Department of the Government of India: creation of Army and Military Supply Departments.
	Eastern Bengal and Assam constituted a separate administration under a Lieutenant-Governor with a Legislative Council. (November 18.) Lord Minto, Viceroy.

made in England. The other posts are recruited provincially, and are, like posts in the general service, graded as belonging either to a provincial service, or to a subordinate service¹.

The
chartered
high
courts.

It is only with reference to the four chartered high courts that the judicial system of India is regulated by English statute. Under the Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63), a supreme court was established by charter for Calcutta, and similar courts were established for Madras in 1800 (39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79), and for Bombay in 1823 (4 Geo. IV, c. 71). The Act of 1781 (21 Geo. III, c. 70) recognized an appellate jurisdiction over the country courts established by the Company in the Presidency of Bengal².

The Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), amalgamated the supreme and sadr courts at the three presidency towns (that is to say, the courts exercising the jurisdiction of the Crown and the appellate and supervisional jurisdiction of the Company at those towns), by authorizing the establishment of chartered high courts inheriting the jurisdiction of both these courts. The charters now regulating these high courts were granted in December, 1865. The same Act authorized the establishment of a new high court, and accordingly a charter establishing the High Court at Allahabad was granted in 1866.

Each of the four chartered high courts consists of a chief justice, and of as many judges, not exceeding fifteen, as His Majesty may think fit to appoint³.

A judge of a chartered high court must be either—

- (a) a barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, of not less than five years' standing; or
- (b) a member of the civil service of India of not less than ten years' standing, and having for at least three years served as, or exercised the powers of, a district judge; or

¹ See East India (Progress and Condition) Decennial Report, 1904, pp. 53-60.

² See above, p. 57.

³ Digest, s. 96.

- (c) a person having held judicial office not inferior to that of a subordinate judge, or judge of a small cause court, for not less than five years ; or
- (d) a person having been a pleader of a high court for not less than ten years ¹.

But not less than one-third of the judges, including the chief justice, must be barristers or advocates, and not less than one-third must be members of the civil service of India ¹.

Every judge of a chartered high court holds office during His Majesty's pleasure ², and his salary, furlough, and pension are regulated by order of the Secretary of State in Council ³. Temporary vacancies may be filled by the Governor-General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta, and by the local government in other cases ⁴.

The jurisdiction of the chartered high courts is regulated by their charters ⁵, and includes the comprehensive jurisdiction formerly exercised by the supreme and *sadr* courts ⁶. They are also expressly invested by statute (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 15) with administrative superintendence over the courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction, and are empowered to—

- (a) call for returns ;
- (b) direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such court to any other court of equal or superior jurisdiction ;
- (c) make general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of those courts ;
- (d) prescribe forms for proceedings in those courts, and for the mode of keeping book entries or accounts by the officers of the courts ; and
- (e) settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriffs, attorneys, clerks, and officers of the courts ⁷.

¹ Digest, s. 96.

² Ibid. 97.

³ Ibid. 99.

⁴ Ibid. 100.

⁵ Printed in *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*, vol. vi.

⁶ Digest, s. 101.

⁷ Ibid. 102.

made in England. The other posts are recruited provincially, and are, like posts in the general service, graded as belonging either to a provincial service, or to a subordinate service¹.

The
chartered
high
courts.

It is only with reference to the four chartered high courts that the judicial system of India is regulated by English statute. Under the Regulating Act of 1773 (13 Geo. III, c. 63), a supreme court was established by charter for Calcutta, and similar courts were established for Madras in 1800 (39 & 40 Geo. III, c. 79), and for Bombay in 1823 (4 Geo. IV, c. 71). The Act of 1781 (21 Geo. III, c. 70) recognized an appellate jurisdiction over the country courts established by the Company in the Presidency of Bengal².

The Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), amalgamated the supreme and sadr courts at the three presidency towns (that is to say, the courts exercising the jurisdiction of the Crown and the appellate and supervisional jurisdiction of the Company at those towns), by authorizing the establishment of chartered high courts inheriting the jurisdiction of both these courts. The charters now regulating these high courts were granted in December, 1865. The same Act authorized the establishment of a new high court, and accordingly a charter establishing the High Court at Allahabad was granted in 1866.

Each of the four chartered high courts consists of a chief justice, and of as many judges, not exceeding fifteen, as His Majesty may think fit to appoint³.

A judge of a chartered high court must be either—

- (a) a barrister of England or Ireland, or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland, of not less than five years' standing; or
- (b) a member of the civil service of India of not less than ten years' standing, and having for at least three years served as, or exercised the powers of, a district judge; or

¹ See East India (Progress and Condition) Decennial Report, 1904, pp. 58-60.

² See above, p. 57.

³ Digest, s. 96.

- (c) a person having held judicial office not inferior to that of a subordinate judge, or judge of a small cause court, for not less than five years ; or
- (d) a person having been a pleader of a high court for not less than ten years¹.

But not less than one-third of the judges, including the chief justice, must be barristers or advocates, and not less than one-third must be members of the civil service of India¹.

Every judge of a chartered high court holds office during His Majesty's pleasure², and his salary, furlough, and pension are regulated by order of the Secretary of State in Council³. Temporary vacancies may be filled by the Governor-General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta, and by the local government in other cases⁴.

The jurisdiction of the chartered high courts is regulated by their charters⁵, and includes the comprehensive jurisdiction formerly exercised by the supreme and *sadr* courts⁶. They are also expressly invested by statute (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104, s. 15) with administrative superintendence over the courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction, and are empowered to—

- (a) call for returns ;
- (b) direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such court to any other court of equal or superior jurisdiction ;
- (c) make general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of those courts ;
- (d) prescribe forms for proceedings in those courts, and for the mode of keeping book entries or accounts by the officers of the courts ; and
- (e) settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriffs, attorneys, clerks, and officers of the courts⁷.

¹ Digest, s. 96.

² Ibid. 97.

³ Ibid. 99.

⁴ Ibid. 100.

⁵ Printed in *Statutory Rules and Orders Revised*, vol. vi.

⁶ Digest, s. 101.

⁷ Ibid. 102.

But these rules, forms, and tables are to be subject to the previous approval of the Government of India or of the local government¹.

The business of the chartered high courts is distributed among single judges and division courts in accordance with rules of court, subject to any provision which may be made by Act of the Governor-General in Council².

The Governor-General in Council may by order alter the local limits of the jurisdiction of the several chartered high courts, and authorize them to exercise jurisdiction over Christian subjects of His Majesty resident in Native States³.

The old enactments requiring the chartered high courts, in the exercise of their original jurisdiction with reference to certain matters of which the most important are inheritance and succession, when both parties are subject to the same law or custom, to decide according to that law or custom, and when they are subject to different laws or customs, to decide according to the law of the defendant, are still in force, subject to such modifications as have been or may be made by Indian legislation⁴.

Traces of the old conflicts between the supreme court and the governor-general's council are still to be found in enactments which exempt the governor-general and the governors of Madras and Bombay and members of their council from the original jurisdiction of the chartered high courts in respect of anything counselled, ordered, or done by any of them in their public capacity, from liability to arrest or imprisonment in any civil proceeding in a high court, and from being subject to the criminal jurisdiction of a high court in respect of any misdemeanour at common law or under any Act of Parliament⁵. Nor are the chartered high courts to exercise original jurisdiction in revenue matters⁶.

Jurisdic-
tion of
English

The highest officials in India are exempted from the jurisdiction of the Indian chartered high courts, but under enact-

¹ Digest, s. 102.

² Ibid. 103.

³ Ibid. 104.

⁴ Ibid. 108.

⁵ Ibid. 105.

⁶ Ibid. 101.

ments which are still in force¹ certain offences by persons courts holding office under the Crown in India are expressly made ^{over} punishable as misdemeanours by the High Court in England. ^{offences} in India.

These offences are :—

- (1) Oppression of any of His Majesty's subjects ;
- (2) Wilful breach or neglect of the orders of the Secretary of State ;
- (3) Wilful breach of the trust and duty of office ;
- (4) Trading ; and
- (5) Receipt of presents.

Under an Act of 1797 (37 Geo. III, c. 142, s. 28), any British subject² who, without the previous consent in writing of the Secretary of State in Council, or of the Governor-General in Council, or of a local Government, is concerned in any loan to a native prince, is guilty of a misdemeanour.

Any of these offences may be tried and punished in England, but the prosecution must be commenced within five years after the commission of the offence or the arrival in the United Kingdom of the person charged, whichever is later³.

Supreme authority over the army in India is vested by law ^{The army} in the Governor-General in Council⁴. Under the arrangements ^{in India.} made in 1905 the commander-in-chief of His Majesty's Forces in India has charge of the Army Department, which to a certain extent corresponds to the War Office in England. Subject to the administrative control of the Governor-General in Council, the same commander-in-chief is also the chief executive officer of the army. Under the system in force before the changes introduced by the Act of 1893 he held special command of the troops in the Bengal Presidency, and exercised a general control over the armies of Madras and Bombay. Each of these armies had a local commander-in-chief, who might

¹ Digest, s. 117.

² This probably means any European British subject. See Digest, s. 118.

³ This is the period fixed by 21 Geo. III, c. 70, s. 7. But the period under 33 Geo. III, c. 52, s. 141, is six years from the commission of the offence and a shorter period is fixed by the general Act, 56 & 57 Vict. c. 61. See Digest, s. 119.

⁴ See *ibid.* 36.

be, and in practice always was, appointed a member of the governor's executive council, and the local Government of the presidency had certain administrative powers in military matters. This system of divided control led to much inconvenience, and by an Act of 1893 (56 & 57 Vict. c. 62) the offices of the provincial commanders-in-chief were abolished, and the powers of military control vested in the Governments of Madras and Bombay were transferred to the Government of India.

The administrative arrangements under the Act of 1893 came into force on April 1, 1895. The Army of India was then divided into four great commands, each under a lieutenant-general, the whole being under the direct command of the commander-in-chief in India and the control of the Government of India. In 1904 one of the commands was abolished, and the army is now organized in three commands and two independent divisions, one of which, however, will probably be absorbed into one of the commands.

The army in India consists, first, of His Majesty's forces, which are under the Army Act, and, secondly, of the native troops, of which the British officers are under the Army Act, whilst the remainder are under the Indian Articles of War, an Act of the Indian Legislature¹. In 1905 the total strength was nearly 231,000 men of all arms, of whom rather more than 78,500 (including the British officers of the Indian Army) were British. This is exclusive of the active reserve, in process of formation, consisting of men who have served with the colours in the Native Army from 5 to 12 years, and numbering now about 24,500 men, and of the volunteers, about 32,000 in number, enrolled under the Indian Volunteers Acts (XX of 1869, as amended by X of 1896).

When the Native Army was reorganized in 1861, its British officers were formed into three 'staff corps,' one for each of the three armies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay. The officers of the corps were, in the first instance, transferred

¹ Act V of 1869, as amended by Act XII of 1894.

from the East India Company's army, and were subsequently drawn from British regiments. In 1891 the three staff corps were amalgamated into a single body, known as the Indian Staff Corps. In 1902 the use of the term 'Staff Corps' was abandoned, and these officers are now said to belong to the Indian Army. The number of their establishment is nearly 3,200. They are recruited partly from young officers of British regiments and batteries in India, and partly by the appointment of candidates from the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, to an unattached list, from which they are transferred to the Indian Army after a year's duty with a British regiment in India. After passing examinations in the native language and in professional subjects, an officer of the Indian Army is eligible for staff employment or command in any part of India. The officers of the Indian Army are employed not only in the Native Army and in military appointments on the staff, but also in a large number of civil posts. They hold the majority of appointments in the Political Department, and many administrative and judicial offices in non-regulation provinces.

The Charter Acts of 1813 and 1833 provided for the appointment of bishops at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and conferred on them ecclesiastical jurisdiction and power to admit to holy orders. These provisions are still in force¹, but the bishops who have been since appointed for other Indian dioceses, such as the diocese of Lahore, do not derive their authority from any Act of Parliament. The salaries, allowances, and leaves of absence of the Indian bishops and archdeacons are regulated by the King or by the Secretary of State in Council².

The provisions summarized above include all the matters relating to the administration of India which are regulated by Act of Parliament, with the exception of some minor points relating to salaries, leave of absence, temporary appointments, and the like.

¹ Digest, ss. 110-112.

² Ibid. 113, 114.

The salaries and allowances of the governor-general and the governors of Madras and Bombay, and of their respective councils, of the commander-in-chief, and of lieutenant-governors, are fixed by order of the Secretary of State in Council, subject to limits imposed by Act of Parliament¹.

Return to Europe vacates the offices of the governor-general, of the governors of Madras and Bombay, and the members of their respective councils, and of the commander-in-chief², except that members of council can obtain six months' leave of absence on medical certificate³.

There is power to make conditional appointments to the offices of governor-general, governor, and member of council⁴.

If a vacancy occurs in the office of governor-general when there is no successor or conditional successor on the spot, the Governor of Madras or Bombay, whichever is senior in office, fills the vacancy temporarily⁵. A temporary vacancy in the office of Governor of Madras or Bombay is filled by the senior member of council⁶. Provision is also made for filling temporary vacancies in the offices of ordinary or additional members of council.

Absence on sick leave or furlough of persons in the service of the Crown in India is regulated by rules made by the Secretary of State in Council⁷. The distribution of patronage between the different authorities may also be regulated in like manner⁸.

Administrative arrangements not dependent on Acts of Parliament.

The administrative arrangements which have been summarized above depend mainly, though not exclusively, on Acts of Parliament. To describe the branches of administration which depend not on Acts of Parliament, but on Indian laws or administrative regulations, would be beyond the scope of this work. For a description of them reference should be made to such authorities as Sir John Strachey's

¹ Digest, s. 80.

² Ibid. 82. The precise effect of the enactments reproduced by this section is far from clear.

³ Ibid. 81.

⁴ Ibid. 83.

⁵ Ibid. 85.

⁶ Ibid. 86.

⁷ Ibid. 89.

⁸ Ibid. 90.

excellent book on India, or the latest of the decennial reports on the moral and material progress of India. Only a few of them can be touched on lightly here.

In the first place something must be said about the Indian ^{Financial} financial system. The principal heads of Indian revenue, ^{system.} as shown in the figures annually laid before Parliament, are land revenue, opium, salt, stamps, excise, provincial rates, customs, assessed taxes, forest, registration, and tributes from Native States. The principal heads of expenditure are debt services, military services, collection of revenue, commercial services, famine relief and insurance, and civil service. But during recent years the services grouped as commercial, namely, post office, telegraph, railways and irrigation, have shown a surplus, and have been a source of revenue and not of expenditure. The most important head of revenue is the land revenue, a charge on the land which is permanently fixed in the greater part of Bengal and in parts of Madras, and periodically settled elsewhere.

The central government keeps in its own hands the collection of certain revenues such as those of the Salt Department in Northern India, the Telegraph Department, and the revenues of Coorg, Ajmere, and the North-West Frontier Province, besides certain receipts connected with the Army and other services. It also deals directly with the expenditure on the Army and the Indian Marine, on certain military works, on railways and telegraphs, on the administration of the three small provinces whose revenue it receives, and on the mint, and with the greater part of the post office expenditure and of the political charges.

The other branches of revenue are collected and the other branches of expenditure are administered by the provincial or local governments. But the whole of the income and expenditure, whether collected or borne by the central or by the local government, is brought into one account as the income and expenditure of the Indian Empire.

Since 1871 the relations between central and provincial

GOVERNORS-GENERAL OF FORT WILLIAM IN BENGAL¹.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1774. Warren Hastings (Governor of Bengal from 1772).
 1785. Sir J. Macpherson (temporary, February 1, 1785, to September 12, 1786).
 1786. Lord Cornwallis.
 1793. Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth).
 1798. Sir Alured Clarke (temporary, March 6 to May 18, 1798).
 1798. Earl of Mornington (Marquis Wellesley).
 1805. Lord Cornwallis (took office July 30, died October 5).</p> | <p>1805. Sir George Barlow (temporary, October 10, 1805, to July 31, 1807).
 1807. Lord Minto.
 1813. Lord Moira (Marquis of Hastings).
 1823. John Adam (temporary, January 9 to August 1, 1823).
 1823. Lord Amherst.
 1828. W. B. Bayley (temporary, March 13 to July 4, 1828).
 1828. Lord William Bentinck.</p> |
|--|--|

GOVERNORS-GENERAL OF INDIA.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1834. Lord William Bentinck.
 1835. Sir Charles Metcalfe (temporary, March 20, 1835, to March 4, 1836).
 1836. Lord Auckland.</p> | <p>1842. Lord Ellenborough.
 1844. Sir Henry (Lord) Hardinge.
 1848. Lord Dalhousie.
 1856. Lord Canning.</p> |
|--|---|

VICEROYS AND GOVERNORS-GENERAL

(FROM NOV. 1, 1858).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1858. Lord Canning (continued as Viceroy).
 1862. Lord Elgin.
 1864. Sir John (Lord) Lawrence.
 1869. Lord Mayo.
 1872. Lord Northbrook.
 1876. Lord Lytton.</p> | <p>1880. Lord Ripon.
 1884. Lord Dufferin.
 1888. Lord Lansdowne.
 1894. Lord Elgin.
 1899. Lord Curzon.
 1905. Lord Minto.</p> |
|---|---|

PRESIDENTS OF THE BOARD OF CONTROL.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1784. Lord Sydney.
 1790. W. W. Grenville (afterwards Lord Grenville).
 1793. Henry Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville).
 1801. Lord Lewisham (afterwards Dartmouth).
 1802. Lord Castlereagh.
 1806 (February 12). Lord Minto.</p> | <p>1806 (July 26). Thomas Grenville.
 1806 (October 1). George Tierney.
 1807. Robert Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville).
 1809 (July). Lord Harrowby.
 1809 (November). Robert Dundas (afterwards Viscount Melville).
 1812. Earl of Buckinghamshire.
 1816. George Canning.</p> |
|--|--|

¹ For more minute particulars as to dates see the India List.

finance have been regulated by quinquennial contracts between the central and each provincial government. Under these contracts the whole, or a proportion, of certain taxes and other receipts collected by each provincial government is assigned to it for meeting a prescribed portion of the administrative charges within the province.

The provincial governments have thus a direct interest in the efficient collection of revenue and an inducement to be economical in expenditure, since savings effected by them are placed to their credit. But they may not alter taxation, or the rules under which the revenue is administered, without the assent of the Supreme Government. Subject to general supervision, and to rules and conditions concerning such matters as the maintenance of great lines of communication, the creation of new appointments, the alteration of scales of salaries, and the undertaking of new general services or duties, they have a free hand in administering their share of the revenue. The apportionment of revenue is settled afresh every five years, after a review of the provincial finance. Any balance which a provincial government can accumulate by careful administration is placed to its credit, but on occasions of extraordinary stress, as during the Afghan War, the central government has sometimes called upon local governments to surrender a share of their balances.

Adminis-
trative
staff of
local
govern-
ments.

As has been said above, the governors of Madras and Bombay are assisted by executive councils. A lieutenant-governor has no executive council, but has the help of a Board of Revenue in Bengal, Eastern Bengal and Assam, and the United Provinces, and of a Financial Commissioner in the Punjab and Burma. Madras has also a Board of Revenue. Each province has its secretariat, manned according to administrative requirements, and also special departments, presided over by heads, such as the inspector-general of police, the commissioner of excise, the director-general of education, the inspector-general of civil hospitals, the

sanitary commissioner, and the chief engineer of public works, for the control of matters which are under provincial, as distinguished from central management. There may be also special officers in charge of such matters as experimental farms, botanical gardens, horse breeding, and the like, which require special qualifications but do not need a large staff.

The old distinction between regulation and non-regulation provinces¹ has become obsolete, but traces of it remain in the nomenclature of the staff, and in the qualifications for administrative posts. The corresponding distinction in modern practice is between the regions which are under ordinary law, and the more backward regions, known as scheduled districts, which are under regulations made in exercise of the summary powers conferred by the Government of India Act, 1870 (33 Vict. c. 3)².

Regulation and non-regulation provinces.

In each province the most important administrative unit is the district. There are 249 districts in British India. They vary considerably in area and population, from the Simla district in the Punjab with 101 square miles to the Upper Khyndwin in Burma with approximately 19,000 square miles, and from the hill district of North Arakan with a population of 20,680 to Maimansingh with a population of 3,915,000. In the United Provinces the district has an average area of 1,500 or 2,000 square miles, with a population of 750,000 to 1,500,000. But in several provinces, and especially in Madras, the district is much larger.

The district.

At the head of the district is the district magistrate, who in the old regulation provinces is styled the collector and elsewhere the deputy commissioner. He is the local representative of the Government and his position corresponds more nearly to that of the French *préfet* than to that of any English functionary³.

The district magistrate and his staff.

¹ See above, pp. 101, 102.

² See above, p. 105, and East India (Progress and Condition) Decennial Report (1904), pp. 56, 57.

³ See Strachey, 359. East India (Progress and Condition) Decennial Report (1904), p. 57.

He has assistants and deputies varying in number, title, and rank, and his district is sub-divided for administrative purposes into charges which bear different names in different parts of the country.

In most parts of India, but not in Madras, districts are grouped into divisions, under commissioners, who stand between the district magistrate and his local government.

If the district is, *par excellence*, the administrative unit of the Indian country, the village may be said to be the natural unit. It answers, very roughly, to the English civil parish or the continental *commune*, and it is employed as the unit for revenue and police purposes. Its organization differs much in different parts of India, but it tends to be a self-sufficing community of agriculturists. It has its headman, who in some provinces holds small police powers; its accountant, who keeps the record of the State dues and maintains the revenue and rent rolls of the village; and its watchman and other menials. In Bengal the village system is less developed than elsewhere.

Municipal
and district
councils.

Under various Acts of the central and local Indian legislatures municipal and district councils have been established in the several provinces of India with limited powers of local taxation and administration. This system of local government received a considerable extension under the viceroyalty of Lord Ripon¹.

Judicial
arrange-
ments.

Reference has been made above to the four chartered high courts. But the term 'high court,' as used in Indian legislation², includes also the chief courts of those parts of British India which are outside the jurisdiction of the chartered high courts. These are the chief court of the Punjab, established in 1866, the chief court of Lower Burma, established in 1900, and the courts of the judicial commissioners for

¹ See Government of India Acts I, XIV, XV, and XX of 1883, XIII and XVII of 1884; Bengal Act III of 1884; Bombay Acts I and II of 1884; Madras Acts IV and V of 1884.

² See s. 3 (24) of the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897).

Oudh, the Central Provinces, Upper Burma, Berar and Sind. The Punjab chief court has at present six judges, the Lower Burma chief court four. The new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam remains under the jurisdiction of the Calcutta high court.

These non-chartered high courts exercise with respect to the courts subordinate to them the like appellate jurisdiction, and the like powers of revision and supervision, as are exercised by the chartered courts, and their decisions are subject to the like appeal to the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

The procedure of the several civil courts is regulated by the general Code of Civil Procedure, but their nomenclature, ^{juris-}classification, and jurisdiction depend on Acts passed for the different provinces. There is usually a district judge for a district or group of districts, whose court is the chief civil tribunal for the district or group, and who usually exercises criminal jurisdiction also as a sessions judge. There are subordinate judges with lesser jurisdiction, and below them there are the courts of the munsif, or of some petty judge with a similar title. The right of appeal from these courts is regulated by the special Act, and by the provisions of s. 584 of the Code of Civil Procedure as to second appeals. In the presidency towns, and in some other places, there are also small cause courts exercising final jurisdiction in petty cases.

The constitution, jurisdiction, and procedure of criminal ^{Criminal} courts are regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure, ^{juris-}which was last re-enacted in 1898 (Act V of 1898). In every province, besides the high court, there is a court of sessions for each sessional division, which consists of a district or group of districts. The judge of the court of sessions also, as has been seen, usually exercises civil jurisdiction as district judge. There may be additional, joint, and assistant sessions judges. There are magistrates of three classes, first, second, and third. For each district outside the presiding

towns there is a magistrate of the first class called the district magistrate, with subordinate magistrates under him. For the three presidency towns there are special presidency magistrates, and the sessions divisions arrangements do not apply to these towns.

A high court may pass any sentence authorized by law. A sessions judge may pass any sentence authorized by law, but sentences of death must be confirmed by the high court. Trials before the high court are by a jury of nine. Trials before a court of sessions are either by a jury or with assessors according to orders of the local Government.

Presidency magistrates and magistrates of the first class can pass sentences of imprisonment up to two years, and of fine up to 1,000 rupees. They can also commit for trial to the court of sessions or high court.

Magistrates of the second class can pass sentences of imprisonment up to six months and of fine up to 200 rupees.

Magistrates of the third class can pass sentences of imprisonment up to one month and of fine up to fifty rupees.

In certain parts of British India the local Government can, under s. 30 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, invest magistrates of the first class with power to try all offences not punishable with death.

In certain cases and under certain restrictions magistrates of the first class, or, if specially so empowered, magistrates of the second class, can pass sentences of whipping.

A judge or magistrate cannot try a European British subject unless he is a justice of the peace. High court judges, sessions judges, district magistrates, and presidency magistrates are justices of the peace ex-officio. In other cases a justice of the peace must be a European British subject. If a European British subject is brought for trial before a magistrate he may claim to be tried by a mixed jury.

India, as defined by the Interpretation Act, 1889 (52 & 53 Vict. c. 63, s. 18), and by the Indian General Clauses Act (X of 1897, s. 3 (27)), includes not only the territories

comprised in British India, that is to say, the territories under the direct sovereignty of the Crown, but also the territories of the dependent Native States. These are upwards of 600 in number. They cover an area of nearly 700,000 square miles, and contain a population of about 62,500,000. Their total revenues are estimated at nearly Rx. 20,000,000¹. They differ from each other enormously in magnitude and importance. The Nizam of Hyderabad rules over an area of 83,000 square miles and a population of more than 11,000,000. There are petty chiefs in Kathiawar whose territory consists of a few acres².

The territory of these States is not British territory. Their subjects are not British subjects. The sovereignty over ^{of sovereignty.} them is divided between the British Government and the ruler of the Native State in proportions which differ greatly according to the history and importance of the several States, and which are regulated partly by treaties or less formal engagements, partly by sanads or charters, and partly by usage. The maximum of sovereignty enjoyed by any of their rulers is represented by a prince like the Nizam of Hyderabad, who coins money, taxes his subjects, and inflicts capital punishment without appeal. The minimum of sovereignty is represented by the lord of a few acres in Kathiawar, who enjoys immunity from British taxation, and exercises some shadow of judicial authority.

But in the case of every Native State the British Government, as the paramount Power,— ^{General control by British Government.}

- (1) exercises exclusive control over the foreign relations of the State ;
- (2) assumes a general, but limited, responsibility for the internal peace of the State ;—

¹ Rx = tens of rupees.

² For further details as to the Native States see East India, Moral and Material Progress, Decennial Report (1904), pp. 15-50 ; and on the general position of these States see :—Tupper, *Our Indian Protectorate* ; Lee-Warner, *Protected Princes of India* ; Strachey, *India*, ch. xxiv ; Westlake, *Chapters on Principles of International Law*, ch. x ; and below, chapter v.

- (3) assumes a special responsibility for the safety and welfare of British subjects resident in the State ; and
- (4) requires subordinate co-operation in the task of resisting foreign aggression and maintaining internal order.

Control
over
foreign
relations.

It follows from the exclusive control exercised by the British Government over the foreign relations of Native States, that a Native State has not any international existence. It does not, as a separate unit, form a member of the family of nations. It cannot make war. It cannot enter into any treaty, engagement, or arrangement with any of its neighbours. If, for instance, it wishes to settle a question of disputed frontier, it does so, not by means of an agreement, but by means of rules or orders framed by an officer of the British Government on the application of the parties to the dispute. It cannot initiate or maintain diplomatic relations with any foreign Power in Europe, Asia, or elsewhere. It cannot send a diplomatic or consular officer to any foreign State. It cannot receive a diplomatic or consular officer from any foreign State. Any attempt by the ruler of a Native State to infringe these rules would be a breach of the duty he owes to the King-Emperor. Any attempt by a foreign Power to infringe them would be a breach of international law. Hence, if a subject of a Native State is aggrieved by the act of a foreign Power, or of a subject of a foreign Power, redress must be sought by the British Government ; and, conversely, if a subject of a foreign Power is aggrieved by the act of a Native State, or of any of its subjects, the foreign Power has no direct means of redress, but must proceed through the British Government. Consequently the British Government is in some degree responsible both for the protection of the subjects of Native States when beyond the territorial limits of those States, and for the protection of the subjects of foreign Powers when within the territorial limits of Native States. And, as a corollary from this respon-

sibility, the British Government exercises control over the protected class of persons in each case.

The British Government has recognized its responsibility for, and asserted its control over, subjects of Native Indian States resorting to foreign countries by the Orders in Council which have been made for regulating the exercise of British jurisdiction in Zanzibar, Muscat, and elsewhere. By these orders provision has been made for the exercise of jurisdiction, not only over British subjects in the proper sense, but also over British-protected subjects, that is, persons who by reason of being subjects of princes and States in India in alliance with His Majesty, or otherwise, are entitled to British protection. And the same responsibility is recognized in more general terms by a section in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890 (53 & 54 Vict. c. 37, s. 15), which declares that where any Order in Council made in pursuance of the Act extends to persons enjoying His Majesty's protection, that expression is to include all subjects of the several princes and States in India.

The consequences which flow from the duty and power of the British Government to maintain order and peace in the territories of Native States have been developed at length by Mr. Tupper and Sir William Lee-Warner. The guarantee to a native ruler against the risk of being dethroned by insurrection necessarily involves a corresponding guarantee to his subjects against intolerable misgovernment. The degree of misgovernment which should be tolerated, and the consequences which should follow from transgression of that degree, are political questions to be determined with reference to the circumstances of each case.

The special responsibility assumed by the British Government for the safety and welfare of British subjects, whether English or Indian, within the territories of Native States, involves the exercise of very extensive jurisdiction within those territories. The territories of British India and of the Native States are inextricably interlaced. The territories of

Power to
maintain
peace.

Special
responsi-
bility for
British
subjects
in Native
States.

the Native States are intersected by British railway lines, postal lines, and telegraph lines. British subjects, European and Indian, freely and extensively resort to and reside in Native territory for purposes of trade and otherwise. For each Native State there is a British political officer, representing the civil authority exercised by the paramount power, and in each of the more important States there is a resident political officer with a staff of subordinates. Detachments of British troops occupy cantonments in all the more important military positions.

For the regulation of the rights and interests arising from this state of things an extensive judicial machinery is required. It varies in character in different places, and its powers are not everywhere based on the same legal principles. For the proper control of the railway staff it has sometimes been found necessary to obtain a formal cession of the railway lands. In other cases, a cession of jurisdiction within those lands has been considered sufficient. The jurisdiction exercised in cantonments has been sometimes based on the extra-territorial character asserted for cantonments under European international law. And a similar extra-territorial character may be considered as belonging to the residencies and other stations occupied by political officers ¹.

Subordinate
military
co-operation.

The duty incumbent on Native States of subordinate co-operation in the task of resisting foreign aggression has been recognized and emphasized by arrangements which were made during Lord Dufferin's viceroyalty with several of these States for maintaining a number of selected troops in such a condition of efficiency as will make them fit to take the field side by side with British troops. Other States have engaged to furnish transport corps. The total number of these contingents is about 17,500 men. The officers and men are, to a great extent, natives of the State to which they belong, but they are inspected and advised by British officers ².

Exceptional

The result of all these limitations on the powers of the

¹ See below, Chapter v.

² Strachey, *India*, p. 451.

Native Indian States is that, for purposes of international law, they occupy a very special and exceptional position. 'The principles of international law,' declared a resolution of the Government of India in 1891¹, 'have no bearing upon the relations between the Government of India as representing the Queen-Empress on the one hand, and the Native States under the sovereignty of Her Majesty on the other. The paramount supremacy of the former presupposes and implies the subordination of the latter.'

¹ Gazette of India, No. 1700 E, August 21, 1891.

GENERAL HISTORY.	INDIA.
<p>1858 (February 25). Lord Derby, Prime Minister.</p> <p>1859. Italian War.—Battles of Magenta and Solferino. (June 18.) Lord Palmerston, Prime Minister.</p>	<p>1858. Government of India Act, 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 106), places British India under direct government of Crown.—Lord Canning, Viceroy. (November 1.) Queen's Amnesty Proclamation published in India.</p> <p>1859. Punjab constituted a Lieutenant-Governorship under Sir John Lawrence. Indian Code of Civil Procedure passed.</p>
<p>1865 (November 6). Lord Russell becomes Prime Minister on death of Lord Palmerston.</p> <p>1866. War between Prussia and Austria.—Battle of Königgrätz or Sadowa. (July 6.) Lord Derby, Prime Minister.</p> <p>1868 (February 27). B. Disraeli, Prime Minister. Abyssinian expedition. (December 9.) W. E. Gladstone, Prime Minister.</p>	<p>1860. Indian Penal Code passed.</p> <p>1861. Indian Civil Service Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 54), Indian Councils Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 67), and Indian High Courts Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 104), passed by Parliament. —Code of Criminal Procedure passed in India.</p> <p>1862–3. Lord Elgin, Viceroy.</p> <p>1864–9. Lord Lawrence, Viceroy.</p> <p>1864. Bhután Dwārs annexed.</p> <p>1865. Indian Succession Act passed.</p>
<p>1866. Famine in Orissa.</p> <p>1867 (September). Straits Settlements separated from India.</p> <p>1868. Sher Ali, Amir of Afghanistan.</p> <p>1869–72. Lord Mayo, Viceroy.</p> <p>1869. Legislative Department of Government of India established.</p> <p>1872. Indian Contract Act and Evidence Act passed.</p> <p>1872–6. Lord Northbrook, Viceroy.</p> <p>1876–80. Lord Lytton, Viceroy.</p> <p>1876–8. Famine in India.</p>	<p>1866. Famine in Orissa.</p> <p>1867 (September). Straits Settlements separated from India.</p> <p>1868. Sher Ali, Amir of Afghanistan.</p> <p>1869–72. Lord Mayo, Viceroy.</p> <p>1869. Legislative Department of Government of India established.</p> <p>1872. Indian Contract Act and Evidence Act passed.</p> <p>1872–6. Lord Northbrook, Viceroy.</p> <p>1876–80. Lord Lytton, Viceroy.</p> <p>1876–8. Famine in India.</p>